

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHATEVER Professor James Bissett PRATT says is well said, and convincingly said. No one need accept every single statement he makes as the only possible view; no one would be more surprised than Professor PRATT himself if that were suggested. Yet whatever he says, if not always and invariably and equally satisfying, has this great merit at least that it is suggestive and, even when rather provocative, opens up lines and vistas of thought that were perhaps quite unnoticed before.

Such rare qualities characterize a very interesting and, to our mind, important contribution of his to the April *Hibbert Journal* entitled 'The Function of Religion in Modern Life.' We wish it could be put into the hands of every preacher, especially of the younger generation. They need it; we know some who need it badly.

We need not dwell on the opening section, which deals with a working definition of religion and with the Freudian criticism, echoed by writers like Leuba and Martin, and partially adopted by Lippmann, that religion is merely or mainly a case of escape-psychology. It is conceded that in the case of some forms of religion there may be a good deal of relevance in the charge, and so the Freudian accusation is a useful enough warning which we shall always do well to keep in mind. But Professor PRATT is sure that it does not hold of faith that is sincere and open-eyed, placing loyalty to truth before loyalty to venerable beliefs.

The real question is, What is the function of religion—a sincere and open-eyed religion—in the life of our time?

First, if religion is to fulfil a real function in our world it must continue to give a large place to the 'social' gospel. The teaching of Jesus had both individual and social implications; and while neither has ever been altogether neglected, the place given to the social gospel was inadequate for a considerable time before the early years of the present century. Social preaching has accomplished something, and there is still much to be done.

But Professor PRATT points out that it is possible to entertain extravagant expectations of what the preaching of the social gospel will accomplish. True, Society may be made aware of its defects, a public conscience may be quickened and enlightened, and so on. But is religion able alone to solve social problems? Scarcely; basally they are economic or political as well as moral. Religion alone, therefore, cannot solve them, and the high optimism of the early exponents of the social gospel has not been justified.

Besides, suppose social reform were complete, what, then, of the function of religion? This to Professor PRATT is a very puzzling question. It may seem clear that if Christianity be just a social gospel, then in a fully Christianized society there

would be no real need for it, any more than there would be for a Society for the Abolition of Slavery in a world in which no slaves existed.

A second function of religion is not only to enforce morality with Divine sanctions, but to impart to men the secret of true moral living. Society can conceivably legislate men into negative goodness; but no legislation can compel or even greatly help men to love goodness, nor can it make men to *be* good. Legislation 'can perhaps prevent men from hating or ignoring the good; something more is needed if they are to be led to will and love it.' And experience throughout the ages has proved that religion does that. It is one function of religion in our time, as it has always been, 'to set men's hearts on fire with a new love of goodness.'

A third, and perhaps the greatest function of religion in our time as in all time, is to keep alive in man 'the cosmic sense.' Man has it in him, and it is one of his highest unique glories, to take a conscious attitude towards 'the Determiner of Destiny.' Enthusiasts for the 'social' gospel need to be on their guard here. It is well to exhort men to love their brother, but in some quarters that is so exclusively preached that there is grave risk of God being forgotten. 'A colleague of mine tells me that nearly all the sermons he has heard during the past twenty-five years are of one general type. The preacher says: "There are two Great Commandments—thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart; and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Leaving aside the first of these for the present, let us consider the second."'

Religion's function—the greatest—is 'to restore to our minds and to keep before our attention our easily vanishing sense of God.' 'Social reform and soup-kitchens are admirable and needed. But man was made not only for these, but for something greater than these.' The minister of to-day ought not to aim at being nothing more than 'everybody's little helper'—assisting with very poor equipment the physician, the psychiatrist, the social worker, or the economist; he ought to claim his own very

special field and fulfil with all his might his function within it. That field is not economics nor psychiatry nor abstract morals, but religion; and that function is just what it has always been since the days of the Founder—the saving of souls.'

The last generation of theologians, in their reaction from an age of dogmatics, devoted themselves to criticism. They explored the individuality of each Biblical writer, studied the human side of his character, and assessed the value of his contribution to Christian thought. The result in many cases was to give the impression of great variety and even mutual inconsistency among New Testament writers, and to detract from their authority when taken as a whole.

The age of criticism is manifestly passing. It has no doubt made a contribution of permanent value in illuminating the background of the New Testament and in exhibiting the rich many-sidedness of its teaching. But now theology has entered upon a fresh task of synthesis, that is, of putting the various writings alongside each other and showing the unity of the faith which underlies them and the Divine message which they are all alike striving to express.

A notable example of this comes to hand in *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, by Professor C. H. DODD (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). It consists of four lectures all too brief, but of that rare quality of Christian scholarship which we have learned to associate with the name of Professor DODD.

The New Testament makes a clear distinction between preaching (*kerygma*) and teaching (*didache*). Teaching had to do with ethical instruction, to some extent also with apologetics and the exposition of theological doctrine. Much of our preaching is of that sort and 'would not have been recognized by the early Christians as *kerygma*.' Preaching or *kerygma* was very definitely the public proclamation of Christianity to the non-Christian world. 'For

the early Church to preach the Gospel was by no means the same thing as to deliver moral instruction or exhortation. While the Church was concerned to hand on the teaching of the Lord, it was not by this that it made converts. It was by *kerygma*, says Paul, not by *didache*, that it pleased God to save men.¹

What, then, is the substance of this *kerygma*? Briefly, it is that the prophecies are fulfilled and the New Age is inaugurated by the coming of Christ. Born of the seed of David, He died according to the Scriptures to deliver us out of the present evil age. He was buried and rose on the third day, according to the Scriptures. He is exalted at the right hand of God, as Son of God and Lord of quick and dead, and He will come again as Judge and Saviour of men. 'Finally, the *kerygma* always closes with an appeal for repentance, the offer of forgiveness and of the Holy Spirit, and the promise of salvation, that is, of the life of the Age to come, to those who enter the elect community.'

A careful study of the New Testament writings brings to light these essential and invariable elements in the gospel message alike in the Apostolic preaching as recorded in the Acts and in the references to the *kerygma* which are found in St. Paul's Epistles. 'It is very significant that it follows the lines of the summary of the preaching of Jesus as given in Mk 1⁴, 15: "Jesus came into Galilee preaching the Gospel of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God has drawn near; repent and believe the Gospel." This summary provides the framework within which the Jerusalem *kerygma* is set.'

Now in this *kerygma* the eschatological element is strongly marked, but it is important to realize clearly what its real significance was. There was, doubtless, a lively expectation prevalent in the Early Church that the final hour had struck and the end of all things was at hand. But as years passed it became increasingly manifest that 'eschatology is not itself the substance of the Gospel, but a form under which the absolute value of the Gospel facts is asserted. The second advent is not the

supreme fact, to which all else is preparatory; it is the impending verification of the Church's faith that the finished work of Christ has in itself absolute value.'

This led to a concentration of attention upon the historical facts of the ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus, exhibited in an eschatological setting which revealed them as not simple facts of history, but as saving facts. Under this influence the Synoptic Gospels were written. They have been spoken of from early times as 'Memoirs of Jesus,' but that is a completely mistaken classification. They are expressly *kerygma*. 'The theme of Mark's Gospel is not simply the succession of events which ended in the crucifixion of Jesus. It is the theme of the *kerygma* as a whole. This is indeed indicated as the evangelist's intention by the opening phrase which gives the title of the work, "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ." What is true of Mark is true also of the other synoptists. An analysis of any of them will show that their narrative is an orderly unfolding of the fundamental elements of the *kerygma* in such a way as to show their saving significance.

A further development and interpretation of the *kerygma* is found in the writings of St. Paul. Jewish prophecy had spoken much of the emergence in the last days of a supernatural Messianic community. St. Paul recognized the Christian Church as the fulfilment of these prophecies. The Church here and now is the ideal Israel, not simply waiting for the fulfilment of the promises, but in the actual enjoyment of the blessings of the Kingdom. Christ is the Head, and believers are the members of His body, partaking through their union with Him of His eternal life. 'This was the true solution of the problem presented to the Church by the disappointment of its naïve expectation that the Lord would immediately appear; not the restless and impatient straining after signs of His coming which turned faith into fantasy and enthusiasm into fanaticism; but a fuller realization of all the depths and heights of the supernatural life here and now.'

The same development is manifest in St. John's

Gospel. In Jewish prophecy the promise of the Messianic Age was associated with the knowledge or vision of God. 'The Fourth Evangelist takes up the idea, and declares that now, as never before, authentic knowledge of God is available for men in union with Christ, the Son who knows the Father as He is known by Him; and such knowledge is eternal life.' This eternal life is the present heritage of Christian people who are born again by water and the Spirit. For them, here and now, life is fully real, while they are nurtured on the *real* Bread and abide in the *real* Vine. With this in view St. John writes his Gospel. In its outline it follows very closely the fixed order of the Apostolic *kerygma* from the heralding of Jesus by prophecy to His triumphant manifestation as the Son of God with power by His resurrection from the dead. Like the other Gospels, it is 'written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.'

It becomes clear, therefore, that the Apostolic gospel is a very definite message concerned with the person, life, and work of Jesus Christ. Any preaching which does not base itself on these facts and interpret them as the Apostles interpreted them is not properly to be called Christian preaching. This raises a vital problem in connexion with modern preaching. It has been said that 'the modern man does not believe in any form of salvation known to ancient Christianity,' and it must frankly be confessed that the formulation of the gospel in eschatological terms is as strange as it could well be to the modern mind. This has led to many attempts to get rid of it. 'We have tried to believe that criticism could prune away from the New Testament those elements in it which seemed to us fantastic, and leave us with an original "essence of Christianity," to which the modern man could say, "That is what I have always thought." But the attempt has failed. At the centre of all lies this alien, eschatological Gospel, completely out of touch, as it seems, with our ways of thought.'

We shall do well to remember that the gospel was alien to much of the thought of the Apostolic

Age. It was to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness. None the less it proved itself the power of God unto salvation. We must beware of preaching 'another Jesus and another Gospel.' 'To select from the New Testament certain passages which seem to have a modern ring and to declare that these represent the permanent element in it, is not necessarily to preach the Gospel.' The one question of vital moment is, are the fundamental affirmations of the Apostolic *kerygma* true and relevant? If they are, then they must be proclaimed whether men hear or forbear, and in the full assurance that in them will still be found the power of God unto salvation.

One of the most searching questions which from various quarters is being pressed upon the Church of to-day is whether Christianity is of essential importance in view of the social and religious needs of the world. The question is not new, but its urgency arises from the fact that it is being raised from so many angles at one and the same time. For this reason we cordially welcome a living and well-informed study of this issue in Dr. Nicol MACNICOL's book, *Is Christianity Unique?* (S.C.M.; 6s. net).

Dr. MACNICOL is already well known as a distinguished student of Oriental religions. His 'Living Religions of the Indian People' is described by no less an authority than Mr. Edward Thompson as a 'wise and tolerant and widely learned book.' Long residence in India has permitted him to see Christianity from points of view peculiarly suited to the difficulties of the present world situation. As he shows so clearly, there are many points of contact between Hindu-Buddhist types of religion and influential tendencies of thought in the West in respect of the reality of the world, the freedom of personality, the nature of God, and the problem of evil. The question continually emerges whether Christianity has a unique and vital message.

Dr. MACNICOL sees the renewal of an Oriental invasion of thought in the West in modern times

in the philosophy of Schopenhauer, in Richard Wagner, in Leo Tolstoy, and in Friedrich Nietzsche. He also traces its effects in such varied quarters as the 'German Faith Movement,' in the poetry of W. B. Yeats and G. W. Russell, and in the writings of Thoreau, Emerson, and Walt Whitman. He finds the common characteristic of a continuous and significant movement of thought in the close association of two processes, 'the one an uprush through the often shallow crust of Christian civilization of primitive instincts and fears and dreams, and the other a resort to Oriental ideas and Oriental interpretations of life, a resort that may be said to be due to such a "failure of nerve" as, at the beginning of the Christian Era, caused a similar Oriental invasion.'

In such a situation the problem of the relation of Christianity to other faiths sounds a note of increased urgency. Is there any door of hope in the endeavour fostered, for example, by Dr. Rabindranath Tagore and Sir S. Radhakrishnan, to create a new Hinduism which inherits ancient Hindu tradition, but shares with Christianity some of the spiritual fruits it is more naturally fitted to bring forth? What is our reply to the summons of Radhakrishnan: 'Let us become soldiers on the march, soldiers of truth, soldiers fighting with love as our weapons, overturning the universe until the reign of God is established on earth'?

It is obvious that the questions of tolerance and of the limits of syncretism call for the most serious attention from Christian thinkers of to-day. It is impossible not to be deeply stirred by feelings of sympathy and appreciation by the words just quoted, but it is no less necessary to think very carefully about the vital interests that are involved. Dr. MACNICOL's study of the inter-racial problems of religion is all the more welcome just because it combines a true and deep sympathy for all that is best in non-Christian faiths with a calm and discriminating analysis of their underlying ideas and a just and penetrating estimate of the contribution of the Christian message to the various aspects of human need. He strikes a note which ought to be sounded when he says: 'There is a core of

adamant in our Christian faith that is not any one's private property to barter or to buy or sell.'

What is the authority of Christianity among the religions? Dr. MACNICOL helps us to face this question when he distinguishes three alternative answers which are possible.

'First, then, are we to say that we are just one company among many human companies that are seeking to help each other in a common darkness, all of us coming up together out of the night, with Christ leading us, while Buddha and Muhammad lead other companies? . . . Or, to take the second alternative, are we to claim that the only light in the whole dim world has shone on us and on none besides us, so that we have a right and duty to go to these benighted ones with a gift that is wholly strange to them, a gift of One who is wholly Other than all the best that they have ever thought and hoped? . . . Or, again, is there a third answer possible, this, namely, that Christ is indeed the true Light, Light of Light eternal, while all of us, children of men, have had kindled within us—just because we are children of men—flickering candles, smoking flax, lit all alike at the first by the divine Hand, but now poor, dim, guttering lamps that can only shine again if they are kindled anew, if they can have their oil replenished from the Source?'

Dr. MACNICOL's answer is the third. He finds the second answer in the attitude of Karl Barth to non-Christian religions: 'In preaching this good news one must not parley, but simply announce. One must not count upon the development of elements already present, but upon creation out of nothing. One does not proclaim healing to the sick, but resurrection to those who are dead.' He is well alive to the 'cathartic power' of Barth's message and its value in bringing us back to a viewpoint which is central and which we have been in danger of neglecting for points of view that are lower and less commanding in their range. But he is no less convinced that in this realm the great German prophet does not indicate the right path.

'The danger of this great and greatly needed message of Karl Barth is not only that in others than himself it might induce apathy and accidie, but that it tends to represent the world and its concerns as illusions, as being the veil that conceals God instead of being a medium by which He reveals Himself.'

Dr. MACNICOL sees a decided leaning in the direction of the first of the alternatives indicated above in the Report published by a commission of American laymen entitled 'Re-thinking Missions,' in the demand for 'co-operative religious inquiry through give and take,' and in the opinion: 'Hence all fences and private properties in truth are futile; the final truth, whatever it may be, is the New Testament of every existing faith.' As against this point of view he justly maintains that 'Christianity is not, and surely never has been, a view to which men have climbed, even under the leadership of Christ. It is a Revelation of which He is the centre.'

Among many quotations we are tempted to give from this wise and informing discussion we must limit ourselves to two. 'There is no intellectual error that we are so prone to, and there is none that so obscures the light that we are called to walk in, as that pantheism that so subtly invades our thoughts, deceiving us by its gracious tolerance, but at the same time blinding our eyes to evil and paralysing our spiritual growth.' 'Here, indeed, is to be found, it would appear, the final cleavage among the religions. . . . On the one side stand those religions and philosophies which view all things as holding within themselves a purpose and significance that may be discovered and realised, and that, therefore, we conclude, are maintained by the will, and enshrine the thought, of a living God; on the other are those for which, sooner or later, life is accepted as being no more than a chaos of unreality, a region of night and death.' We can only say that he is a wise man who submits himself in his search for a conclusion on this vital issue to the patient and skilled guidance of Dr. Nicol MACNICOL.

A highly suggestive book has come out of the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching, given at Yale University in 1935, and now rewritten for publication: *The Renewing Gospel*, by Dr. Walter Russell BOWIE (Scribner's; 6s. net). The writer has not attempted to show the preacher how to make sermons, or even how to preach. He is concerned with a much more important matter, *what* to preach. 'If there is confusion here, no imaginable brilliancy can make his form of words convincing.' And there *is* confusion here, he thinks. 'Neither those who preach nor those who listen are always quite sure of what the Christian Gospel ought to be in relation to the world and time in which we live; but our urgent business is to discover that.'

But do men and women in this present time want a gospel? Is this a day of opportunity for a preacher who has an eternal conviction to proclaim? Or will even the fire of a great faith be only like flares plunged into the sea? Is this generation susceptible to a religious awakening, or is this one of the drear periods of disbelief when no spiritual fires will burn? On the whole the writer takes a favourable view. He judges differently of an earlier period, about 1919, or just after the War. At that time people's minds were filled with other matters. They were not crying out for religion. But that brief space was followed by one 'more honest and more acid.' Many writers were engaged in deflating men's opinion of themselves. They assailed the human spirit with furious winds of depreciation and contempt. And, though this might have been carried too far, and pessimism lead to a despair of truth, yet it has brought us into contact with reality. And Dr. BOWIE has come to the conclusion that, though our contemporaries may not be in possession of a gospel, they are ready to receive one.

And it is the special business of this book to try to frame a gospel adapted to the needs of a generation which is beginning to believe that 'we build in vain unless the Lord build with us.' In his chapter, 'Some Blazes on the Theological Trail,' therefore, Dr. BOWIE lays down some fundamental

conditions which such a gospel must fulfil. The first is that *it must face facts*. The preacher ought to learn from science its one great lesson. 'Sit down before fact as a little child,' wrote Huxley to Charles Kingsley, 'be prepared to give up every preconceived notion . . . or you shall learn nothing.' And that is what many preachers will not do. There are facts deduced by modern study of the Bible crying out to be at least recognized. There are facts gathered in the field of comparative religion that show what is important and what is unimportant in Christianity. There are real facts discovered by the new science of psychology. There is the impatience of the younger generation with orthodox irrelevances.

It is urgent that religion rethink its formularies in the light of discovered truth. There is intellectual confusion everywhere which is making people lose sight of the old religious landmarks. There is bewilderment at the assertions of a materialistic psychology which makes people wonder whether there is a soul. The social and economic chaos has made many doubtful of the existence of spiritual values. The academic training which ministers receive tends to make them oblivious of much of this. They are trained to move in a world that is limited, and to that extent unreal. They often fail to come to grips with the real concerns with which most people are wrestling. One thing, therefore, that must be pressed upon the pulpit to-day is, that, when it declares the fact of God, this should be done in full view of stark and pressing reality.

A second point made here is that for the Christian preacher authority must be the authority, not of dogmatism, but of *discovery*. It is generally asserted that men revolt against dogmatism. But the strange thing is that our generation is witnessing a strong tendency towards dogmatism. Many people, sceptical or despairing of the ability of the individual to arrive at any decisive truth, have sought assurance or peace, not in experience or demonstration by the individual, but in an authority that is outside and comes with a claim to infallibility. Hence the drift to Fundamentalism on the one hand, and

Romanism on the other. This tendency is observable in our Divinity Colleges where there has been a curious revival of fundamentalism.

Such an attitude cannot meet the 'cry for religion' in our time. What is needed is the rediscovery of the truth that lay at the heart of the great dogmas. Saul of Tarsus saw something great in Jesus, and stated it in burning words that by and by hardened into a dogma. Luther rediscovered the same truth, and stated it differently. Wesley did the same. And in our day Schweitzer has made the same discovery. None of these men repeated the dogma that was made out of Paul. But all saw the same blessed truth. This is the real urgency of the modern pulpit. We need to *see* the great reality that is in Christ, not simply repeat the dogmas of Incarnation, Virgin Birth, Atonement, that have grown out of Christ's life and work. It is vision we need to meet the world's craving—vision, experience, *discovery*.

A third point Dr. BOWIE makes is that our message must be conceived in terms not of finality, but of *fertility*. Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin are given as examples of a finality which will sooner or later bring a harvest of disaster. But the same must be said of religion. It is true that in great ways Jesus was final, because love is ultimate, and God's love cannot be transcended. But the finality Dr. BOWIE deprecates is that which builds a fence round human understanding, which tries to define what has been rather than to proclaim what might be. Religious experience is never mere rediscovery. Paul did not mechanically reflect his Master. He had to express his experience in his own words. The gift of creative souls is not to fasten others within the limits of their creation, but to awaken creativeness in them.

You may find illustrations of this deadly tendency to check the impulses of creative faith in the claim of some churches that their 'order' is final since it comes from Christ or Scripture, in the finality arrogated to the classic creeds, and perhaps most fatally in the resistance offered to the application of the Christian gospel to practical affairs, on the

ground that there is no warrant for this in the New Testament. The truth is, there is a gospel that paralyses the human mind, and there is a gospel that liberates and inspires it. God has still some light to break forth for this generation. And

one of the sheer necessities of the preacher to-day is the courage and insight to perceive the new lines along which the grace of God may travel and the new opportunities He is offering to His servants for initiative and spiritual adventure.

Some Outstanding Old Testament Problems.

VIII. The Bearing of Archæology on Old Testament Criticism.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTHSHIRE.

THE purpose of this article is not to refer to archæological facts illustrating the Bible, but rather to consider the bearing of these facts on Old Testament criticism. By such criticism we mean, of course, not captiousness or fault-finding, but that department of scholarship, in its wider sense, which exercises common judgment, not only upon the text of the Bible, but also upon its contents and the problems involved—in other words, which applies the mind inquiringly and intelligently to all these matters. Criticism of this nature is inevitable and welcome, establishing our knowledge upon a firmer basis, and is no more presumptuous than the examination of any other literature. Without it, Old Testament history would be largely wanting in order and proper development. The bearing of archæology upon such criticism lies in the fact that archæological results show the framework within which Israel, with her unique revelation, must be set, if we are to understand her history and disentangle the revelation. They place the historical movements and the other main events in their correct chronological order and position, and thus they contribute the necessary additional data for the problems which criticism has to solve. As the evidence they afford is external and of a valuable contemporary nature, they help to confirm or correct the views of critics. A few generations ago, Biblical archæology was practically non-existent. Old Testament critics had to depend almost entirely upon internal evidence for the solution of their problems. But now it has developed so extensively and scientifically that it has become a necessary adjunct to criticism. Its results, when based on assured evidence, are gladly accepted by critics, as all reverent criticism is by qualified archæologists.

We must take care, of course, what we put forward as archæological results, for these are not so easy to interpret as some people suppose. In particular, we must be on our guard against confusing them, as some writers do, with ingenious suppositions or hypotheses, which often turn out on examination to be incorrect or unjustifiable. Sometimes, under the foolish prejudice that archæology and Biblical criticism (especially what is known as the 'Higher Criticism') are opposed to each other, discoveries in Palestine are misused to the disparagement of the latter. Some writers are so anxious to shatter criticism of any kind that they are inclined to overpress their arguments, or unwittingly rest them on erroneous evidence. Archæology and Biblical criticism, it should be understood, are not in the least antagonistic, any more than science and religion can be in a universe under the control of one God. Both are needed as helps to each other, and to the intelligent understanding of the Bible.

Within recent years enormous discoveries of the greatest value have been made relating to the ancient civilizations of the Near East. The light has come not only from Palestine, but from all the neighbouring countries—Egypt, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Assyria, Asia Minor, and other lands. Excavations have revealed arts, customs, rites, languages, literatures, political institutions, chronologies, and other matters, the nature and extent of which were quite unknown even a generation ago. It is not too much to say that the entire civilization of the Near East, Palestine as much as other lands, extending over four or five millennia B.C., has been largely disinterred and made intelligible to Biblical students of the present day. All these discoveries have naturally poured such a

flood of light upon the dark places of Israelite history that Old Testament criticism could hardly remain unaffected. In view of the vast amount of external evidence, the complete assurance with which some advanced critics wrote has turned out unjustified. Criticism has passed through a period of transition into a new and more trustworthy sphere. It is modifying its views in some matters, becoming more constructive instead of merely negative, and readily revising any conclusions to which it came on the narrower field of its own researches. The result is that the old mechanical view of the Bible is being replaced by a better conception of its great historical and religious movements. There are undoubtedly many conflicting opinions still, but there is more certainty in the field of operation. Critics are tending to retreat from the extravagances represented by Duhm, Marti, Hölscher, and others, and are inclined to take a more conservative and central position. The historicity of the Old Testament, it may be said, stands now in higher estimation than ever.

At what points has archaeology thus come into touch with criticism? How has the immense and rapidly increasing mass of evidence affected the problems involved? It may be stated at once that, so far, it has established nothing as to the original text of the Old Testament (as a whole at least), the sources of the component parts of the Hexateuch, the truth or otherwise of the documentary analysis (J, E, H, D, P) and the Grafian reconstruction, the possible existence of a *Laienschrift* (L) writing in the Pentateuch (as advocated by Eissfeldt), the relation of the prophets to the Law, the identity of the Servant of Yahweh in Deutero-Isaiah, the origin of the Book of the Covenant (Ex 20²²⁻²³), the date of the Decalogue, and similar Old Testament questions. Archaeology may have modified some of the critical positions hitherto taken up on these points, but this is about all. It cannot be said, moreover, that it has settled the fundamental differences between Sellin and Cornill, except that it is disposed to uphold the historicity of Gn 14, as Sellin does, and postulates, like him, a far larger intellectual horizon in early Israel than hitherto imagined. Nor has it given any definite decision regarding the respective views of Hölscher and Welch as to the aim, composition, and date of Deuteronomy, except that the results of excavation prove the relatively early origin of much of the Israelite law and ritual, as Welch has insisted on. After all, it is mainly literary remains that can help such criticism, and these are scarce in Palestine, where writers appear to have used

papyrus, skins, and other materials liable to perish in the damp climate. Excavators have not unearthed any royal inscriptions of the Hebrew monarchy, though many such were probably in existence at one time. This lack of written records is an undoubted hindrance to Biblical criticism. Everywhere on the matters just mentioned uncertainties abound, owing to critics being dependent for a solution of their problems on internal evidence alone. It can be truly said, however, that the foundations of reconstruction laid by Wellhausen still stand, so far at least as their main features are concerned. The priority of P is not likely to be defended by any serious scholar. In what way, then, it may be asked, has archaeology affected Biblical criticism?

First, it has enabled Biblical criticism to place the Hebrew nation in its proper setting, as having close affinities and connexions with surrounding nations. A generation ago scholars were inclined to regard the Hebrew people as occupying an isolated position in Canaan, disconnected largely from others. One outstanding result, however, of archaeological research has been to establish their essential unity with surrounding peoples in custom, language, social usage, civil and criminal law, and even religious institutions, myths, and ritual. Discoveries have shown how greatly they were influenced by the ancient and imposing civilization of Babylonia, of which country Palestine was for many centuries a province (up to about 1500 B.C.), as well as by the remarkable culture and peculiar institutions of Egypt (as shown by the scarabs and other objects of Egyptian manufacture found in Palestinian ruins). We know now that, so far from differing from these and adjacent nations, and being witnesses in every way of a direct Divine revelation, they were more or less closely akin to them and exhibited numerous correspondences with them. This, of course, does not detract from their distinctive religious character, nor from the Divine and imperishable truth of which they became the exponents to the world. In this respect, at least, their civilization and culture had numerous elements not borrowed from the regions of the Euphrates and the Nile, and an immense gulf lay between them and their neighbours—a fact which the newer criticism must not forget. But at the same time it does take them out of the detached situation which they were previously supposed to hold. The proof of the matter is seen not only in the fact that the movements of political parties in Israel and Judah were frequently connected in a very intimate way with events outside, but in the

similarity of laws, customs, and institutions with those of adjoining peoples. In addition to the Code of Hammurabi, published in 1902, which contains nearly three hundred Babylonian laws dating from about 2100 B.C. (or earlier), we have now the Assyrian Code, published in 1920 and belonging to about the twelfth century B.C., as well as the Hittite Code, published in 1921 and going back to about the thirteenth century. A comparison of these legislative documents with the Mosaic laws shows that the identity of the two in many particulars is very singular, and the comparison upsets some of the epoch-making theories of early Biblical criticism. It is not that the framers of the Israelite laws 'copied' the Babylonian Code or any other. They may have been dependent upon it to some extent, but there were principles of legislation which were common to all the regions of the Near East. These had probably emanated from Arabia, the home of the Semites, and were current indeed for many ages before Hammurabi. It was this common law that Israel codified, in affinity with her neighbours, at the same time giving it several golden threads not found, so far as we know, elsewhere—especially those of the love of God and the love of one's neighbour. Similarly, the religious rites of Israel, though distinctive in their own way, bear a remarkable resemblance to those of Phœnicia, Egypt, Babylonia, Moab, South Arabia, and other neighbouring lands. It cannot be replied, of course, as some people do, that Israel imparted her rites to these countries, any more than it can be said that Moses framed the laws of Hammurabi. The fact is that the rites go back to the twilight of Semitic religion, and the resemblances referred to can only be due to affinity of worship. The Ras Shamra Tablets (*c.* 1400–1200 B.C.), *e.g.*, show that several of the Jewish Feasts and Sacrifices were to a large extent similar to the Phœnician. They prove that the three principal agricultural festivals (mentioned in the 'Book of the Covenant'), which the Israelites connected with great epochs in their national history, were not unlike the pre-Israelite ones in Canaan. Even a number of the sacrificial practices in the Old Testament seem identical with those referred to in the tablets, and in nearly all cases the technical expressions used are the same. It is true, the Israelites cleansed and purified the ritual as far as possible for their own use, but this does not affect its resemblance, in the main essentials, to that of the surrounding nations.

It follows from all this that Biblical criticism finds it necessary to be less 'provincial,' and not to explain the literature and religion of Israel so

much as the result of forces within Israel itself. Indeed, excavation has shown that many Biblical references, supposed to apply mainly or only to the Israelites, are better explained by the customs of neighbouring lands—such as the overshadowing wings of God, the enemy as one's footstool, the idea of a Divine kingship, the Divine helping hand, the introduction of worshippers into God's presence, and much else. It must be understood even that some of the characteristics attributed to Yahweh in the Old Testament contain foreign or exotic elements, and on the other hand that pictures of deities on some of the Palestinian seals may really be meant to represent the God of Israel. Owing to such widened horizons, critics have been able to rescue many of their problems from insularity and set them in a larger framework.

Second, recent archæology has assisted Biblical criticism by revealing the immense antiquity of civilization and culture in the Near East—in Palestine as elsewhere—which was unsuspected by the early critics, and it has thus enabled Old Testament scholars to put a more intelligible interpretation upon the earlier records. Discoveries show that a civilization of a remarkably advanced nature existed in these regions at a period considerably anterior to what scholars used to think. As far back as the fourth millennium B.C. there were three very striking civilizations between the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf. One had its centre in Northern Mesopotamia and Iran, another which came from Persia or India (Gn 11²) was located in Sumer, and the third belonged to the Semitic race. All three were in contact with each other and influenced each other. Excavators have unearthed written tablets, beautifully finished and painted pottery, as well as innumerable delicate objects of art, dating even earlier still, in the fifth or sixth millennium B.C., and making it evident that the beginnings of civilization must be put far back into the prehistoric ages. Such cities as Ur, Kish, Lagash, and others were centres of culture long before the Flood. At Tepe Gawra excavations have revealed evidences of a high civilization earlier than the confines of history. Even Jericho during chalcolithic ages was a place of considerable agricultural activity (as evidenced by the numerous grain wells of that date), and its inhabitants could make beautiful basket-work pottery and other objects of refinement. This does not exclude the fact, of course, that side by side with such centres of civilization there were aboriginal elements of a lower type, with their weapons of flint, wood, or bone, who had not entirely emerged from neolithic

influences. But as a rule we find the dwellers all over Palestine, Mesopotamia, and neighbouring countries, in these early ages, constructing palaces and temples, producing exquisite works of art, cultivating the soil, faithful to religious and moral laws, and living not very differently from those of later date. This ancient civilization was accompanied by a widespread organized system of commerce, with intercourse over enormous areas. Caravan or wagon routes ran for a thousand miles and more from east to west. Mesopotamia had commercial relations with India on the one hand, and Egypt on the other. Everywhere the world, as then known, was linked together by commercial ties and correspondence.

This larger aspect of the ancient civilization of the Near East has compelled Biblical critics to revise their views on the chronology of human development, and to put back many of the dates suggested a generation or two ago. We now know that the prophets, Moses, and even the patriarchs were comparatively late-comers on the scene, and that when the Israelites entered Canaan, there was a cultured civilization there which was already ancient, and included commercial and other connexions with distant countries. It follows that we must assume, as some critics have done, a far wider range of thought and intellectual progress for the pre-prophetic period than is apparent in the literature of the Old Testament. We can no longer suppose, as used to be done, that crude ideas were early and more refined ones were late, for archaeological facts contradict this philosophical conception. We must be guided, too, not so much by analogies from pre-Islamic Arabia (as Wellhausen, Robertson Smith, and others were) as by evidence from the new and entrancing world revealed to us by excavation.

Third, by the discovery of ancient tablets and other written records, archæology has given Biblical criticism an assured knowledge of the existence of writing and literary activity in and about Palestine as far back as the earliest Israelite times. It is not so long since it was maintained—popularly at least—that writing was little used or even unknown in these early ages, and consequently that the authors of the historical books of the Old Testament could not have had written materials on which to base their statements. But this belief has been repeatedly disproved within recent years. Not only have whole libraries been uncovered, including the chronicles of Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and other rulers contemporary with the kings of Israel and Judah, but abundant proof has come to

light that writing was habitually used long before Moses and even before Abraham. We have now thousands of tablets from Babylonia and Assyria, going back to the third and fourth millennia B.C., the Serabit el-Khadim inscriptions (c. 1900 B.C.), the Amarna correspondence (c. 1400 B.C.), official writings and important treaties from the Hittite empire dated in the second millennium B.C., the Ras Shamra epics (c. 1400–1200 B.C.), the inscription on the sarcophagus of Ahiiram (c. 1250 B.C.), and many other written memorials belonging to these early times. The result is that the views of Biblical critics in regard to early Israelite history have had to be profoundly modified. There is no difficulty now in concluding that there were ethical codes before Moses, scribes and recorders in Israel when Joshua entered Canaan, numerous written psalms long before David, and an abundance of written proverbs, aphorisms, and meditations ages before Solomon. Such is the culture of these early ages that there must have been a rich literature, both prose and poetry, in Palestine in the time of the Judges.

All this goes to show that the Israelite historians and prophets could have had, and probably did have, written sources at their disposal dating from many generations before the monarchy. There is no longer any need to doubt the existence of such early documents, though they were undoubtedly revised at various times in Israelite history; and the task of the 'Higher Critics' is to disentangle them from the editorial additions and modifications of later ages. It is unnecessary now to cling to writers of a later date, as the older critics have done in their views on J and E. Even the Biblical story of the Conquest, in its original form at least, may be derived from early records almost contemporaneous with the events described. Indeed, all the component parts of the Hexateuch undoubtedly contain much very ancient material. Some of it, of course, may have been originally in the form of poetical saga or stories told round the fires at night and in the sanctuaries, and in the course of time these may have been collected into written narratives. But when we consider the revelations of archæology, there is no strain on our credulity if we consider much of it (especially in J and E) to have consisted of older written material contemporary or almost so with the events themselves, and liable to little or no change. The present writer sees no difficulty in assuming such earlier literature, even of a highly developed kind—not merely national and other songs or dry court chronicles, but actual historical narratives. In an

age when great libraries existed (witness Ras Shamra and others), when schools abounded and the art of reading and writing was widely spread, can we suppose that nothing was done to produce some records of Israelite history, which had so deeply moved the race?

All this has affected the Biblical picture of the early ages, as far back as Abraham's time. According to Wellhausen (*Proleg.*,³ 331), Kuenen, and many others, the picture presented in Genesis of the environment of the patriarchs could only be the one in existence at the later period (ninth and eighth centuries) when the record was thought to have been composed. In other words, the Biblical account simply depicted the circumstances of the prophetic or early monarchical period which had been unintentionally projected back into the Abrahamic age. There have, no doubt, been critics of a more positive tendency, such as König, Strack, Kittel, and Oettli on the Continent, and Dr. Driver and others in this country, who have contested these deductions and have taken firmer ground on the historicity of the patriarchal and Mosaic periods, but on the whole the Wellhausen school has held differently. Excavation, however, has proved the incorrectness of such theories. The patriarchal circumstances, as depicted in the narratives of Genesis, are now known not to be an artificial construction of priestly historians at a much later date, but a remarkably accurate representation of nomadic life in pre-Mosaic times. The primitive nature of the setting, its simplicity of religious ideas and worship, its conception of God, its ethical colouring, and its other characteristics reflect the established practices of the Semitic, Hurrian, and other civilizations of the period. The parallels, indeed, are enough to fill a lengthy brochure; and it is known now that the Biblical records relating to this time contain a greater measure of real historical material than some scholars had supposed, and must have been based not only upon oral tradition, but in some important matters upon authentic documents, whatever the nature of the latter may have been.

The antiquity of literary work suggests, too, that Moses was able to inscribe his laws on tables of stone after the manner of Hammurabi, and make legal and historical records in other forms. It does not prove, of course, as some people seem to imagine, that he wrote the Pentateuch—indeed, it cannot establish conclusions of this nature. The only evidence of such would be the unearthing of a complete copy of the Pentateuch dating from his time or not

long after, and this seems a fanciful dream. Nor does it answer the question how much of the Pentateuchal legislation and teaching is really his work, and how much is a later development. According to some critical theories, little, if any, of the Pentateuch goes back to his time. Whether this be so or not, archæology can do little to determine, for such a question is almost entirely literary and can only be solved satisfactorily by other evidence. So far, archæology has not discovered any mention of Moses or the Decalogue, though it can depict the background of Israel's legal and religious development. What it asserts, however, is that, if we judge from the prevalence of writing in the first period of Israel's history, there is no reason to deny that many of the Pentateuchal laws, including the Decalogue, may have been written down at that early age. The existence of early writing, moreover, goes to show the possibility of many of the psalms having been written during the period of the monarchy or even earlier, for it is difficult to imagine otherwise when archæology confronts us with so much literary work in existence at that epoch, and so many contemporary psalms in Babylonia and elsewhere. Duhm's extravagant late dating, and the more widely spread opinion (held by the Wellhausen school) that no pre-exilic psalms have been preserved, seems therefore to be improbable. We may assume, too, on the same grounds, that the royal psalms date from the epoch of the monarchy rather than from post-exilic times, and may be primarily concerned, like the Babylonian ones of the same type, with the reigning kings, instead of with some future Messianic ruler. At the same time, all this affords no proof that any of the psalms may be traced back to David. No doubt there must have been some foundation for associating his name traditionally with some of them, and it is not unlikely that a few Davidic psalms may be included in the early sections of the book, but archæology so far has nothing to say on this subject.

Fourth, another way in which archæology has aided criticism has been by throwing light on the Old Testament text. It has brought a welcome interpretation to certain obscure words, phrases, and even verses, which have hitherto given difficulty to scholars or even baffled them. The Ras Shamra Tablets, especially, have illuminated many a dark passage, confirmed many conclusions already reached by scholars, and fixed the original form and meaning of innumerable Hebrew expressions. But this question is a large one, and the limits of this article forbid a discussion of it.

Literature.

RELIGION IN THE VICTORIAN ERA.

A NOTABLE addition to the 'Lutterworth Library' appears with the publication of *Religion in the Victorian Era* (Lutterworth Press; 15s. net), by the Rev. L. E. Elliott-Binns, D.D. The author is well practised in historical writing, and has succeeded in giving us a balanced account of his subject. The scope of the treatment is indicated by such chapter headings as the Oxford Movement, Religion and Science, Religion and History, Social Problems, the Cambridge School, Worship, the Ministry, Reunion and Federation. A valuable feature of the work is the space given to secular events, not only in England but in Europe, during the Victorian Era. Politics, education, literature, and social changes all come within the author's purview; and his treatment of these and other subjects is determined by the conviction that a country's history, or religion, cannot be studied in isolation. So he has kept in mind not only the contemporary life of the nation, but, in addition, the shifting background of the general European world.

As a sample of his expositions, take the reference to the study of Comparative Religion in the Victorian Era. Indeed, in the period under review the science of Comparative Religion took its rise. It was really one manifestation of that general interest in origins which was characteristic of the period; and it was stimulated by the provision of a mass of new material by archæologists, and anthropologists, and missionaries. Yet an early missionary writer was reproved by his society on the ground that he was sent to South India 'to destroy the gods and not to write about them.'

Before the Victorian Era there had undoubtedly been some interest in Comparative Religion. But the study probably had its real beginning when, on May 8th, 1840, Thomas Carlyle gave his lecture on Mahomet, afterwards printed in 'Heroes and Hero Worship.' It was something new, as Dr. Elliott-Binns remarks, to have a sympathetic account of the founder of a religion which was a dangerous rival to Christianity. Mention should also be made of F. D. Maurice's lectures on 'The Religions of the World' (1846), in which Christ was represented as fulfilling the desires expressed in other faiths. But it was Max Müller who laid the foundations of the science in this

country. His work was based on the study of Sanscrit and of the religions of the Far East; and it was followed up by W. Robertson Smith, who showed the close connexion between the Semitic religions and the religion of the Old Testament. At this point one misses references to the work of E. B. Tylor and J. G. Frazer, though these deal chiefly with early religion.

One result of the study of Comparative Religion was the realization that religion itself was universally diffused, and that it originated in the earliest times. The fact impressed Herbert Spencer with a conviction of the truth of religion; others saw in religion only a compound of fear and magic. But Aristotle's principle that the end explains the beginnings can surely be applied here. Another result was the realization that heathen religions could not be accounted for as debased survivals of the primitive revelation or as the inventions of priests; and Augustine's teaching that the virtues of the pagans were but 'splendid vices' had to be abandoned. Which led to a whole series of disquieting questions as to the place and status of the Christian religion.

A GREEK PAPYRUS READER.

Ever since the gradual publication of the Oxyrhynchus, Tebtunis, and Hibeh papyri, it has been well known that we have here a treasure-house for the life and customs of Egypt in the later Ptolemaic and the Roman periods and for the illustration of New Testament Greek. It is especially with the latter in view that Professors Edgar J. Goodspeed and E. C. Colwell of Chicago University have edited *A Greek Papyrus Reader* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. net), for, as they write in their preface, some acquaintance with such documents must now be recognized as an indispensable part of a thorough training for New Testament work. The *Reader* has for its frontispiece the photo of a 'Termination of Partnership, A.D. 143,' a good example of a readable popular hand of the period, though perhaps some of our readers who have made good work with the literary hands of the Chester Beatty papyri will be a bit disappointed with the legibility. The book contains eighty-two documents, an admirable selection, comprising, besides some Christian speci-

mens and various receipts, petitions, charms, and private letters, such special items as a Notification of the Accession of Nero, a Census Return, an example of 'Unwritten' or 'Trial' Marriage, Problems in Geometry with Diagrams, Reward for Runaway Slaves, Oath of a Fisherman's Union, Contract with an Orchestra. Each selection has a short introduction, and there is a vocabulary at the end of the book. 'It is our experience that the best results in translation are achieved by the use of texts unaccompanied by English translations, but provided with a concise vocabulary.' If the latter had contained references in the case of the principal words to the places where they occur it would have made the book handier.

There are only five Christian documents—but this is probably over rather than under a fair proportion in the selection—and they contain two amulets and three letters, two of these latter commendations of Church membership, and one personal. The first amulet of the fourth-fifth century A.D. consists of the opening words of the Four Gospels—in the order of Matthew, John, Mark, Luke, with the usual text except in the case of Mark (καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαίας ὁ προφήτης [ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Θεοῦ in this order! and with υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ added, as in Matthew), of Ps 90, of the Lord's Prayer (to τὸ ὄνομα σου), and the Gloria in full. The second is a more elaborate charm by which Joannia hopes to get rid of a hateful spirit, and to be preserved from fevers and chills. St. John is naturally her favourite saint: she uses the first three verses of the Gospel, and there is a rare invocation of Christ as ὁ Θεὸς τῆς προβατικῆς κολυμβήθρας ἐξελοῦ τὴν δούλην σου. At the close of the charm a list of saints whose πρεσβείαι are invoked is headed by τῆς δεσποίνης ἡμῶν τῆς θεοτόκου καὶ τῶν ἐνδόξων ἀρχαγγέλων καὶ ἁγίου καὶ ἐνδόξου ἀποστόλου καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ καὶ θεολόγου Ἰωάννου. Both the letters of commendation begin with χαίρε ἐν κυρίῳ, and close with ἐρρωσθαι σε εὐχομαι ἐν κυρίῳ. Cf. and contr. Ph 3¹ 4⁴, Ac 15²⁹. The personal letter is a touching little human as well as Christian document; it is from a boy, away from home among strangers, to his mother asking specially for her prayers in his loneliness: it begins with the familiar formula πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν, adding παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ Θεῷ, and goes on presently οἶδας γὰρ ὅτι οὐδένα ἔχω σὺν ἐμοί, οὐκ ἀδελφὴν,

οὐκ ἀδελφόν, οὐκ οἰκεῖον, οὐδένα ἄλλον εἰ μὴ μόνον τὸν Θεόν. He reminds one of the story of the tiny chap who was afraid to be left alone in the dark: 'I know, mummy, God is here all the same, but I want some one with a face.'

Even a brief survey of the vocabulary discovers some fifty words and more which would illustrate more or less prominent New Testament ones and enrich or modify their usual rendering. Here are a few: ἄδολος, ἄμφοδον, ἀπάτωρ (= 'father unknown,' *N.B.* how in He 7³ the writer adds ἀμήτωρ, 'protecting the former from its common implication'), ἀπογραφὴ, αὐταρκής, ἐπιβάλλω, εὐλαβῶς, καταντῶ, μονογενής, παρακούειν, προκοπή, προσκαρτερεῖν, φῶς (=fire; cf. Mk 14⁵⁴), χορηγεῖν, χρηματίζειν. A letter from a slave girl to her master, who has fallen ill during absence from home, offers two more in one sentence: ἡγωνίασα, κύριε, οὐ μετρίως, ἵνα ἀκούσω ὅτι ἐνώθρευσας. Moulton and Milligan give several instances of νωθρεύω in the sense of sickness, and cite Boisacq for its kinship with νόσος. Dullness and slackness (He 5¹¹ 6¹³) may be symptoms of a sick state of body or soul, and one thinks of Bishop Paget's famous sermon on the disease of *accidie*. The outstanding thought in ἡγωνία, as an emotion, seems always to be that of *fear*. The first instance in Liddell and Scott from Demosthenes couples it with φόβος, and Field, in 'Otium Norvicense,' commenting on Lk 22⁴³, argues the same from its use and associations in the LXX, and the papyri again and again confirm. All along the Eastern Diatesaron has evidently so understood it, and rendered quite plainly, 'when (or as) he feared, he prayed the more earnestly'; and this is a recurring note in Ephrem's Commentary (e.g. Moesinger, p. 234), ut esuriit, et sitivit et defatigatus est . . . ita et timuit. Haec passus est ut hominibus in terra difficile fieret dicere, 'Sine passione et labore culpaе nostrae ab eo expatiatae sunt.'

THE REVIVAL OF PASCAL.

Pascal's 'Pensées' still hold the attention of many readers, if for nothing else than their human and poetic grandeur. By virtue of this quality alone, apart from many other attractions, they still maintain their position in the religious and intellectual world, both in France and in other countries. In *The Revival of Pascal* (Milford; 12s. 6d. net) we have a study of his relation to modern French thought, by the late Miss Dorothy Margaret

Eastwood, B.A.(Oxon.). In the Preface, Professor Gustave Rudler states that 'no writer can be understood save by one who thinks and feels like him.' In other words, religious thinkers deal best with religion, and rationalists with rationalism. Hence it is that Miss Eastwood (who died two years ago at the age of thirty) was able to produce such an interesting and thoughtful volume, for she seems to have had all the gifts demanded by her subject, such as strong philosophic sense, delicate religious feeling, and tender human sympathy. The word *Revival* in the title is well chosen, as since the end of last century the rise of Pascal's influence in France has been almost miraculous. The volume is not exactly or exclusively a study of his influence, but it seeks rather to describe how, by coming into contact with modern French thought, his 'Pensées' have experienced a kind of resurrection, and have become a living force in the consciousness of France. From being regarded merely as a literary masterpiece, or as a curious product of the intellect, or the record of an intensely vivid personality, they are now extolled for their supreme actuality. There are eleven chapters, packed with most interesting thought, in Miss Eastwood's volume, including such important subjects as 'Poincaré's Criticism of Science,' 'Bergson's Vindication of Personality,' 'The Intuitionist Movement,' 'Moral Pragmatism and Pascal's Wager,' 'The New Apologetic represented by Father Laberthonnière,' and 'The Modern Attitude towards Pascal's Jansenism.' It is not generally known, nor does the gifted authoress mention, what led Pascal to commence his 'Pensées.' On March 24th, 1656, an event occurred which made a profound impression on his mind: his niece, Margaret Périer, appeared to be cured of an eye trouble through having it touched by a 'thorn from the crown of Jesus.' This 'miracle,' as it was called, Pascal regarded as the hand of God confirming him in his faith, and he thereupon conceived the idea of writing a work in which he would overthrow the freethinkers and prove the truth of the Christian religion. We commend Miss Eastwood's critical yet friendly study to ministers, teachers, and all Christian apologists and philosophers. There can be no question as to its distinction or outstanding merit.

PAULINE STUDIES.

Many readers of this journal will recall the excellent expository studies which the Rev. R. Martin Pope, M.A., B.D., has contributed from time to time to its pages, and some will be familiar with

his little book, *Studies in the Language of St. Paul*, which appeared some years ago and is now out of print. A new volume under the same title has now been published by the Epworth Press (3s. 6d. net), which includes the former collection and other studies of a like kind which have never been published before in book form. Mr. Pope's method is to take a Pauline passage or phrase, to examine it carefully from the linguistic point of view, and then to elucidate the thought in an expository manner, illustrating it by the aid of historical allusions and by admirably selected extracts from the poets and other literary writers. The result is an exceedingly choice and suggestive series of studies, which reveal the advantages to be derived from a close study of the original and which are sure to set the mind of a preacher working in a creative manner. In all there are nineteen studies, each introduced by a felicitous title. We confidently recommend this volume to all lovers of the Scriptures, and to preachers and teachers in particular. Its beautiful phrasing, deep insight, ripe scholarship, and spiritual power will render it a cherished possession as both a devotional and as an expository aid of the highest value.

VITAL PREACHING.

The Warrack Lectures on Preaching for 1936, which were delivered by Dr. Sidney M. Berry, Secretary of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, have been published under the arresting title of *Vital Preaching* (Independent Press; 3s. 6d. net). Dr. Berry has arranged his Lectures in a group of five in which successively he treats the Preacher, the Sermon, the Study, the Congregation, and the Sanctuary. In all that he has to say there is a note of challenge and a strong sense of the high calling to which a preacher's vocation belongs. He does not hesitate to warn young students to be open-eyed to the difficult conditions which prevail in the modern world. More preachers, he believes, have been wrecked upon the shoals of self-pity than upon the more obvious rocks of moral failure. Sermons, he says, were meant to die in order that they might live in the lives of those who have been moved by their truth. In these Lectures there is a welcome insistence upon the value of doctrinal preaching. 'Contemporary Christianity is crying out for education, a body of thought which will deliver the pulpit from subjectivism, and give to all its teaching a great objective background.' Dr. Berry is also a believer in a certain amount of expository preaching, and in seeking in the open

air to arrest the attention of those who display a marked reluctance to enter churches. He is insistent in his warnings against the use of loose statements, of an overplus of moral indignation, and of the use of sarcasm in the pulpit. He is the sworn foe of the 'clerical voice,' and would have talkie films made of sermons, so that preachers might see and hear themselves preach. Withal, these counsels are accompanied with kindly exhortations and informing confessions drawn from the day-book of Dr. Berry's experience. Few better books could be placed in the hands of students and young preachers than this slender volume, which ought to make for a higher standard of preaching in days to come.

HISTORY OF EARLY IRAN.

It is only within recent years that excavations have been made in Iran (an immense plateau of which Elam forms a part), and even these have been few in number and confined mostly to the tell of Susa (Biblical Shushan). As a result, historians of this important country, which forms the connecting link between Far East and Near East, have been considerably hampered in their understanding of the ancient Elamite empire there, as well as of its origin and chronology. It is to the credit of Mr. George G. Cameron, Instructor in Oriental Languages in the University of Chicago, that he has been able to produce a *History of Early Iran* (Cambridge University Press; 13s. 6d. net), from the dawn of its activity to the rise of Cyrus the Persian. Other histories of the Iranian plateau usually begin with Cyrus and conclude with Alexander the Great, but in this volume we are furnished with the earliest facts of Elamite and Iranian history, so far as known at present. The author has utilized for his purpose not only the Persian records, but all necessary Babylonian and Assyrian sources, and has been considerably assisted by Professor Olmstead's unpublished notes and manuscripts, as well as by this Oriental scholar's discussions, criticisms, and suggestions. No doubt, until archaeological investigation of Iran has further advanced, and the ruined city-mounds which dot the country have been explored, much of the history of this immense tract must remain buried. The author, however, has described comprehensively and intelligibly what can already be gathered of Iranian history before Cyrus attained the mastery. As Elam cannot be neglected by any serious student of the ancient Near East, the volume should prove a necessary and useful addition to the rather

imperfect histories already in existence. Not all scholars, it may be said, will agree with the Babylonian chronology adopted. Thus, Hammurabi's accession is placed in 1947 B.C., which seems unusually low as compared with the Fotheringham-Langdon date of 2067, or even Shoch's and Thureau-Dangin's 1994.

In these days it is perhaps not easy for many of us to let our interests fare east of Geneva, but the Far East has still power to engage at least our curiosity. What of China, is a question and a problem which bulks large whenever our tired brains attempt to form some judgments on the world-situation. That events of profound and immeasurable importance have been transpiring in that vast region we are all aware. That a veritable ferment in that land of ancient immobility has been produced by the impact of the West we have been told often enough. As to the future of China and the part she may yet come to play in the world we entertain feelings now of high hope, now of fear. The ferment is still proceeding and no man can predict with any certainty what loveliness or what monstrosity may eventuate. Amid our perplexity we welcome *The New Culture in China* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It is written by Professor Lancelot Forster, who holds the Chair of Education in Hong-Kong University, and an Introduction has been contributed by Sir Michael E. Sadler. Professor Forster has had exceptional opportunity to observe what is happening in China, and he is endowed with the qualities which make his observations valuable. The scope of the work will be best illustrated by simple quotation of some of the chapter-headings. They include the New Culture in China, the Revival of Confucianism, Confucianism and the Western System, the Mass Education Movement, the Stress of Life in China, the Japanese Threat. Every chapter is illuminative. The author makes no pretence at ability to predict the course of events, but with all his caution he gives on the whole an impression of hopefulness. It is a book which we can thoroughly recommend.

A perfectly charming book has been translated from the Hungarian language in which it was written—*A Banker meets Jesus*, by Roland von Hegedues, translated by M. L. Christlieb (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). The contents are wider than the title. It is true Jesus is the centre of the book. The banker always comes back to Him, and always with words of intense devotion. Jesus is to him

the centre of the universe. All this is deeply impressive. But if the centre is Jesus, the circle is an extensive one. All sorts of themes come into view. The book is a series of brief studies, largely autobiographical, on whatever is before the writer's mind—books, musicians, Gospel stories, politics, theology. He talks in an unconventional way about it all. There is a fascinating chapter on Beethoven, whom he considers the greatest man after Jesus, and on how Beethoven's music helped him to believe in the doctrine of the Trinity. His reflections on the Johannine literature, on Matthew ("a financier like myself"), on Emil Ludwig's biographies of great men, on scientific advances, are endlessly interesting. In short, here is a religious book about Jesus which any one who loves R.L.S. or Montaigne will find absorbing.

In *The Greek Language in its Evolution* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net) Professor Anatol F. Semenov has essayed a very desirable and important undertaking in seeking to provide, within small compass, a detailed account of the evolution of the Greek language from Homer down to the present day. In Part I. he surveys the forms which Greek has assumed in the course of time, in Ancient Greek and its dialects, in the *Koiné*, in Vulgar Greek, and in Modern Greek and its dialects; and in Part II. he seeks to supply an historical account of the developments of Greek Syntax. The book is well arranged and contains much useful and valuable information, but, unfortunately, its value is seriously diminished by the perfunctory and inaccurate use which is made of the Greek of the New Testament writings. Non-existent passages are mentioned, and it is quietly, but incorrectly, assumed that Matthew contains more Semitisms than Luke. In this respect the book is a silent warning to New Testament scholars how greatly a small but competent manual on the syntax of the New Testament is needed.

Professor Harold J. Laski has given us another very readable book in *The Rise of European Liberalism* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It is replete with suggestion, eloquent in diction, and obviously sincere in conviction. It gives in compact form a great mass of information not easily acquirable by the average political thinker. Yet it has faults. It abounds in allusions which few will understand. The title is scarcely borne out by the contents, for the book deals almost exclusively with Britain and France, ignoring such an important field as Spain. Further, there are still many

Liberals left in the country, though their representatives in Parliament are few, and we are certain that they will differ sharply from Professor Laski in his views of the origin of Liberalism and his view that it was doomed from its cradle. Without embarking on a political discussion, for which our columns have no place, we simply say that we do not believe that it was the ethic of private property that constituted the origin and the continuous motive of Liberalism.

The complaint is often made, not without reason, that Karl Barth's dialectic is so abrupt and enigmatic as to be barely intelligible to the general reader. For any one who wishes to make a first acquaintance with his teaching we can cordially recommend *God in Action* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. net), which seems as clear and admirable as anything Barth has written. The book contains five lectures given on various occasions, but forming a distinct sequence. The subjects are Revelation, the Church, Theology, the Ministry of the Word, and the Christian as Witness. The Divine Word constitutes the Church, and is the subject of Theology. It is regulative of all Christian thought and preaching, and to it the Christian is called to bear witness. In an appendix of considerable length a report is given of a discussion which followed the last of the lectures. It is the most interesting chapter in the book, for Barth is evidently at his best in answering questions, and he makes his points with great clearness and force. Referring to the religious situation in Germany, he utters an impressive warning to the English-speaking churches, part of which may be quoted. "My dear friends from England and America, I am from Germany. There we have reached the end of the road at whose beginning you are standing. . . . For what we have experienced in Germany during these latter days—this remarkable apostasy of the Church to nationalism, and I am sure that every one of you is horrified and says in his heart, I thank Thee, God, that I am not a German Christian! I assure you it will be the end of your road, too. It has its beginning with "Christian life" and ends in paganism. For, you once admit, "Not only God, but I also," and if your heart is with the latter—and, friends, that's where you have it!—there is no stopping it. Let me assure you there are many sincere and very lovely people among the German Christians. But it did not save them from falling a prey to this error. Let me warn you now. If you make a start with "God and ——" you are opening the door to every demon."

A Gospel You Can Believe, by the Rev. Edward Beal (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net), contains over a dozen short sermons or 'disjointed essays,' as the writer calls them. In an appreciative foreword Dr. John McConnachie speaks of them as 'cathartic and bracing, like a wind from the heights.' They are certainly breezy and are expressed in such language as may the more easily catch the ear of the man in the street. One could have wished that the writer had come to closer grips with some of the great problems he handles. But the essays are excellent in their variety and interest, while they are enlivened throughout by a number of capital illustrations.

A New Pulpit Manual (James Clarke; 2s. 6d. net) has been prepared by the Rev. James Burns, M.A., whose previous Pulpit Manual had a wide circulation. The present Manual contains 'forms of prayer for use in the conduct of public worship, suggestive summaries, orders of service for celebration of the sacraments, church festivals, and all other public occasions.' The quality of such a Manual is not to be gauged by a reading, but to be tested in actual practice. It may be confidently said, however, that a very high standard of thought and expression is maintained throughout. The language is chaste and reverent without being too archaic, and very wisely it is based in large measure on the language of Scripture. The section devoted to special services is particularly full and varied. The Manual should prove of great value to ministers who desire to enrich the devotional part of their service.

Professor J. A. Robertson, D.D., whose 'Spiritual Pilgrimage of Jesus' first made his name widely known, and who has followed it with several suggestive and scholarly books on the Gospel narratives, has turned his attention to a subject which suits his poetical pen admirably in *Studies for a Portrait of Jesus* (James Clarke; 2s. 6d. net). Dr. Robertson thinks that in many of the famous portraits of Jesus we miss the more commanding spiritual qualities which are suggested by the material in the Gospels. He has put aside all preconceptions, and allowed himself to be led by the suggestions he finds in the words of the Evangelists. It is impossible, however, for the Professor to discard that poetic imagination which has lent such charm to many of his other studies, and it is not wanting in these new impressions. But one thing the reader will everywhere feel as he reads is that the author has stood before the majestic

figure of Jesus, and looked at it with reverent and loving eyes. The result is that in these chapters we are allowed to share some of the treasure he has found. In six chapters he has studied the Gospel references to the Presence (*i.e.* the Personality), the Face, the Eyes, the Feet and Hands, the Body, and the Voice of Jesus. The 'studies' are all delightfully fresh. They are often deeply moving and impressive, because in this book we listen to one who has gained a new vision of the Lord, who has beheld His glory, full of grace and truth.

Joseph Rutherford is an example of a man whose natural gifts were so great that his early lack of education could not conceal them. His opportunity came when he was called at the age of thirty-seven into the ministry of the Primitive Methodist Church. The manner of man he was may be seen from the fact that his name was proposed for the Principalship of Hartley. He published nothing during his lifetime, but his friends have now collected a number of his sermons—the volume is issued by the Epworth Press with the title *Key Words* (3s. 6d. net). The studies are all on texts from Romans, the Epistle which appealed to him in a special way as containing Paul's great argument for natural Christianity. Conversion, to Rutherford, was man's turning round to live after the law of his own being. We have quoted part of one of the sermons in 'The Christian Year' this month. We hope it will draw attention to the volume.

The Rev. Max Warren, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Cambridge, has published a study of contemporary evangelism under the title *Interpreters* (Highway Press; 2s. 6d. net). The book is divided into three parts: The Word Spoken, The Word made Flesh, The Fellowship of the Word. Roughly corresponding to these three divisions is the three-fold object of the book: first, to indicate the meaning of evangelism; secondly, to illustrate the inbreaking of God into human life all the world over; thirdly, to consider some of the principles underlying evangelistic work. The second object really dominates, and in prosecuting it Mr. Warren has culled a large number of illustrations from Christian experience at home and abroad. His book should be of great interest to those who are engaged in missionary and evangelistic work.

The price of liberty is eternal vigilance, and it is well that among Protestants there should be a

sufficient number on the watch-tower against Romanism. All interested keenly in this vigilance may be advised to study Professor C. J. Cadoux's latest book—*Roman Catholicism and Freedom* (Independent Press; 5s. net), and Protestants who are placidly content to live and let live may be counselled to read it too. The thesis is simply that Rome has never explicitly renounced persecuting principles and that her nineteenth-century record shows that it is lack of power, not change of policy, that has restricted her persecuting practice. Dr. Cadoux on the whole gives a satisfying answer to the counter-charge that Protestants themselves adopted persecuting principles; and his argument as to facts is, as we should expect, fully documented. Of course, here and there one may find something on the other side; for instance, Dr. Cadoux justifiably poking fun at the Roman Index omits an equally entertaining section on Protestant denunciation of books; but we can recommend the work as a sober, learned, and largely convincing piece of polemical writing.

When a writer declares that 'the construction of the Revelation is simple' we know what to expect—a dogmatic interpretation of times and half-times, signs and seasons, which can satisfy none but the mind which conceived it. *The Unveiled Future*, by Mr. L. M. Dorman (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net), is a book of this type. It deals in brief outline with the visions of the Apocalypse and mingles strange fancies with much that is Christian in spirit. The seven churches are the seven ages of the Church. When the saints are suddenly withdrawn from the earth, as many of them will doubtless hold responsible positions on railways and in factories, there will be a prodigious smashing of machinery with disasters that surpass imagination. In the final conflagration in Palestine the petrol pipe to Haifa will burst and add fuel to the flame. The Jordan valley will be elevated till the river flows into the Red Sea. The Suez Canal will be abolished, but a canal from the Jordan to the Mediterranean will make Jerusalem a great seaport. *Sed haec haec hactenus.*

Concerning Himself, by Mr. J. T. Mawson (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net), is a book written in the full assurance of faith. It deals throughout with our Lord Jesus Christ, His miraculous birth, His deity, sinlessness, death, resurrection, and exaltation. It is based upon an unquestioning dependence on the Scriptures as infallible. The writer does not seem able to enter

sympathetically into the difficulties which beset other minds, and his arguments will hardly carry conviction to those that are in doubt. Nevertheless, many will find here a rich vein of Christian teaching, and all must respect the fervour and earnestness with which it is set forth.

Consciousness in Neo-Realism (Milford; 9s. net), by Mr. Binayendranath Ray, M.A., Ph.D. (Dacca), Lecturer in Philosophy, Dacca University, is a study approved for the Ph.D. degree of the University of Dacca by a Board of Examiners consisting of Professors S. Alexander, G. Dawes Hicks, and W. De Burgh. Professor S. Alexander's is one of the chief names associated with the movement of Neo-Realism in philosophy. Other prominent names are those of Bertrand Russell in this country and E. B. Holt and R. B. Perry in America. The scope of this study is restricted to a review and criticism of the contributions of Neo-Realism towards the solution of the problem of consciousness in its ontological and epistemological aspects.

The author first endeavours to show that the American new realist is unable, with his theory of external relations and his method of analysis, to deduce consciousness from a few simple and indefinable 'neutral' entities. Such deduction, it is held, utterly neglects the element of time as a real and determining feature of our concrete experience. Then he turns to Alexander, Russell, and C. D. Broad, but fails also to find in them a satisfactory deduction of consciousness from simpler forms of being.

Passing to the epistemology of neo-realism, the author considers the question of the nature of consciousness. He holds that the American neo-realists obliterate the distinction between the subjective and the objective, thus identifying themselves with the behaviourists, according to whom the mind is purely objective and its subjectivity or inwardness is only a fiction. The British realists dissociate themselves from this view and allow some room for subjectivity. Consciousness is within the responsive organism, and not in the objective environment.

Next are considered the merits of the neo-realistic theory of consciousness, and suggestions are then made towards the formulation of a theory of consciousness assimilating all that is of permanent value in the neo-realistic doctrine. The merits are set forth as (1) the establishment of a monism of primordial stuff as against ontological dualism, (2) the repudiation of the conception of mental substance, and (3) rejection of epistemo-

logical dualism, advocated by the theory, of which Locke was a great champion, traditionally known as representationism.

There is a good deal of repetition in the book, but it appears to be an able and competent piece of work.

In the last few years there have been many books of prayers issued. There must have been dozens, with prayers selected and prayers original. But there has been none, we venture to affirm, better than *A Diary of Private Prayer*, by Professor John Baillie, D.D., D.Litt., S.T.D., of the Chair of Divinity in Edinburgh University (Milford; 3s. 6d. net). We draw attention to the collection because it is the flower of a remarkable spiritual insight. The prayers are original, and they have evidently issued from a searching self-examination and a deep and moving spiritual desire. Each day has its two devotions, one for morning and one for evening. And we can hardly conceive it possible that these prayers should be used without profound ethical and spiritual results. This is a choice book—choice in its simplicity, in its felicitous language, and in its spirituality.

'I believe the main thing is . . . to bring out the glory of peace, its immense difficulty, its call for self-abnegation,' writes Viscount Cecil in a Foreword to *Youth and Peace*, by Mr. T. G. Dunning, M.A., Ph.D. (National Sunday School Union; 2s. net). He thinks that peace has suffered from the unwise insistence by pacifists on the dangers and hardships of war. For these are the very things that attract generous youth. And the main purpose of this book is to insist on the glory of peace, its immense difficulty, its call to self-abnegation. Youth should be shown the challenge to heroic efforts in the perils of our time. The author is not a pacifist, but all through the book there is a passion for peace, and he believes that if youth is properly appealed to it will say, in the words of one of its representatives, 'Tell us the price of peace, and we will pay it.'

The present Dean of St. Paul's is editing a series which is sufficiently described as 'The New Library of Devotion.' It starts with a volume by the well-known preacher, the Rev. R. J. Campbell, D.D., who is now Chancellor of Chichester Cathedral, entitled *The Peace of God* (Nisbet; 2s. 6d. net). Anything Dr. Campbell writes will command attention. We all remember the freshness and originality of his early works. And on this theme

he contrives to be interesting. His attitude to life and to ordinary folk is (or has become) a trifle pessimistic. Many people would demur to a quoted pronouncement such as this, 'Judged by the standard of misery the present time must be the most unhappy moment in the history of the human race.' The aim of the book, however, is edification, and this is achieved in chapters on our need of peace, the nature of peace, the path to peace, helps to peace, hindrances to peace, loss and recovery of peace, and abiding peace. Many devout souls will be helped and comforted by the writer's wise words.

Dean Selwyn of Winchester has written an instructive and inspiring book, *Thoughts on Worship and Prayer* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). Dr. Selwyn was editor of 'Essays Catholic and Critical,' so we know where he stands in the world of theology. His High-Church attitude appears often in this book, notably in his dealing with the question of prayers to the Virgin and the Saints. But it is never a hindrance to the enjoyment of the reader or to his profit. All aspects of worship are considered—communal and individual, public and private—and everywhere we find inspiration and instruction. The chapters are headed, 'Theology and Christian Worship' (the dogmatic foundation), 'The Art of Public Worship' (worship informal, formal but not sacramental, formal and sacramental), and 'Private Prayer.' There is a robust intelligence in these discussions, as well as a devout spirit, which are very appealing.

The Gospel of Fulfilment (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net) is a thoughtful and reverent study of the Fourth Gospel, by the Rev. Robert A. Henderson, M.A., late Vicar of Heckmondwike, Yorkshire. The standpoint is conservative and little attention is given to critical questions, the writer's aim being to set forth what he believes to be the Apostolic Evangelist's meaning and message. An appreciative Preface is contributed by the Archbishop of York.

The Rev. C. S. Phillips, D.D., author of 'The Church in France, 1789-1848: A Study in Revival,' continues his history of religion in France with *The Church in France, 1848-1907* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net). It is a very interesting treatment of very dramatic events. The literary style is crisp, the research has been exhaustive, and every important statement is fully documented. The Roman Church in France within the period under review

experienced various vicissitudes. We have first the strange story of ultramontanist and how it changed its significance from a liberalizing to an enslaving movement. The Church in France was felt by many earnest men to be unworthily in bondage to the State. Ultramontanist in its inception was designed to surmount that Erastianism. The Church, it was believed, might best vindicate her liberties as against the State by putting herself under the closer supervision of the Roman Curia. But speedily that acknowledgment of dependence on Rome turned to a loss of freedom of an at least equally distressing kind. Roman supremacy meant the loss of real power of the bishops and the disappearance of the Gallican liberties for which the Church in France had contended for many centuries. It involved the vanishing of all Gallican usages in the liturgy. Strict conformity to Rome in all things was the price paid.

Then we have the story of the Modernistic movement in which men like Loisy played a distinguished part, and the story of its suppression. Lastly, there is the story of the rise of anti-clericalism and the process by which the Concordat of Napoleon's time was abolished and the religious Orders expelled.

It is, as has been said, a dramatic story, and Dr. Phillips has told it not only well but instructively.

The latest additions to the 'Religion and Life' books published by the Student Christian Movement Press at 1s. net are *Art and Religion*, by the late Canon Percy Dearmer, D.D.; *The Divine Initiative*, by Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.D.; and *Psychology's Defence of the Faith*, by Mr. David Yellowlees, M.B., Ch.B. This is a valuable series containing, as it now does, reprints of so many important works, and we have pleasure in drawing attention to it again.

The Hope of Immortality, by the Very Rev. W. R. Matthews, K.C.V.O., D.D. (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net), contains three lectures given over the wireless, together with an additional chapter, in which some of the questions which were called forth by the lectures are dealt with. That the subject is of living interest is evidenced by the fact that letters were received from nineteen hundred correspondents. The Dean's method in treating the subject is first to discuss the idea of immortality, then to review the various arguments which have been advanced by ancient and modern thinkers, and finally to state the Christian hope based on the resurrection

of Jesus Christ. It is somewhat curious that while acknowledging that the Christian hope is based on the Resurrection and that the New Testament expresses it in terms of resurrection, the lecturer should speak of it throughout in terms of immortality. The whole exposition is clear and simple and free from technicalities. It is likely to prove most stimulating and helpful, and will be widely read.

Psychology and Religion in Early Childhood, by Mr. J. W. D. Smith, M.A., Ed.B. (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net), is a book by a competent educationist who is entirely in sympathy with the religious standpoint. It is therefore a book not to be neglected, even by those who find themselves in disagreement with his somewhat revolutionary position. Briefly, Mr. Smith's conclusion is that the religious education of young children should be indirect rather than explicit and positive. By this he means that children should be helped to an attitude to life, an attitude of courage and security, and not by direct religious teaching. Positive religious teaching may even be, in certain circumstances, a snare and a hindrance to spiritual growth. 'Definite religious teaching and training has very much less religious value than is commonly supposed. . . . Young children are not ready for teaching about God, because as yet they have not learned to look beyond their parents as the source and explanation of all things. . . . In such circumstances it is unsound educationally and spiritually unwise to press the thought of God upon [their] attention.' And, most startling of all, 'whatever religious ideas may be given to the young child it is best at this stage not to attempt to link them with conduct.'

Many people, with as much experience as Mr. Smith, and as good an outfit, will disagree with the thesis of this book. But, all the same, it should be read and considered. Mr. Smith is making a real contribution in his positive contention when he stresses the value of the training, through home, example, suggestion, that gives the kind of courage and independence that are so vital to happiness and peace.

The view that man first appeared on the earth as the result of a Divine creation was very generally held until Charles Darwin published his epoch-making books, 'The Origin of Species' (1859) and 'The Descent of Man' (1871), which affected the trend of thought in biology and other sciences, and indeed changed the whole intellectual outlook

of the world. In *Man: A Special Creation*, by Mr. Douglas Dewar (Thynne; 3s. 6d. net), we have a statement of some of the facts opposed to Darwinian evolution or the 'man-from-ape theory.' As there is hardly an instance of a present-day scientist known to be opposed to the doctrine of transformism in some shape, the author has set himself a very difficult task. After laying stress on man's uniqueness and his special place in Nature, he deals with the various arguments adduced in support of man's animal descent, regarding these as flimsy and untenable. Common sense, he states, inclines us to accept the theory of special creation, which he holds is vouched for by anatomical, psychological, and palæontological facts, as well as by the testimony of the Bible. The doctrine of evolution has led us to think of the world in which we live and of the history of man in terms of a long and gradual development rather than as originating through a special Divine act. We have come to look upon evolution as the method by which the Creator has brought into existence the many and varied forms of life. In other words, He has worked through modal rather than causal processes. Readers of this little volume may not be persuaded to the contrary, and may still regard evolution as solving the problem of man's origin in a way that can help religious belief, and as in no sense atheistic, materialistic, or anti-Biblical. All will agree, however, as to the excellence of the volume, the great importance of the subject, the clear presentation of the matter, and the interest-

ing and varied amount of scientific evidence produced.

A brightly written but very unwise book has been produced by the Rev. Father Superior J. S. M. Ward, entitled *The Psychic Powers of Christ* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). Theologians, he holds, must welcome what help psychic science can give, and what he regards as the proved phenomena of materialization, dematerialization, and levitation enable us to understand how Jesus could pass through hostile crowds, walk on the sea, be transfigured, emerge from the tomb through the stone, and now appear and again disappear after the Resurrection. Father Ward does not realize that such scientific explanation of the miracles so far from confirming faith, makes belief in the incidents easy at the expense of making faith in the Divinity of Christ unnecessary, Jesus being no more than a super-yogi. But worse; he holds that the very foundation of our faith in the Divine Sonship of Jesus lies in Lk 1³⁵; Jesus is Son of God basally because He had no human father. It is in keeping that Father Ward should give the erroneous translation of the verse as it is in A.V., and be quite oblivious that 'Son of God' is a phrase with a pre-history. Worse still, he uses the materialization theory to explain the perpetual virginity of Mary; the foetus was materialized outside the body of the Blessed Virgin. He does not see that if that were so, Jesus was not really born of a woman as the New Testament declares. No; it will not do.

The Teacher and the Old Testament.

BY THE REVEREND F. J. RAE, D.D., DIRECTOR OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION,
 ABERDEEN TRAINING CENTRE FOR TEACHERS.

A QUESTION that inevitably suggests itself at the outset is: Why teach the Old Testament at all? It is confessedly the imperfect stage of revelation. It is full of stories that have a questionable ethical value. We have the perfect stage of revelation in the New Testament. We have Christ's own example and teaching. What values can the Old Testament have for religious or ethical education that are not infinitely richer and greater in the Gospels? The German educational authorities are reported to have banned the Old Testament because

it is a purely Jewish book. And it is. It is the literature of a people who lived before Christ was heard of. In answer to these doubts, there are four perfectly sound propositions that can be stated. I have not space to develop them. (1) The Old Testament has a very high religious value for its own sake. There could be no tales more perfectly embodying the ideal of simple and natural fellowship with God than the stories of Genesis. The Psalms and the high parts of the Prophets contain the loftiest expression of the religious spirit to be

found anywhere. We do not wish our children to leave school ignorant of these sublime passages. (2) The Old Testament is the key to the New Testament. We cannot understand the New Testament apart from its historical and religious background in the Old Testament. That is why Bishop Gore in his volume on Christ spends so much time on the prophets of the Old Testament, in whom Christ's roots were so deeply fixed. Revelation, it must be remembered, is not a communication of truths, but a disclosure of God. It is the unveiling of God's nature and will. And this revelation was given in and through history. We need the whole compass of history to understand it. It is a process, not merely an act. For that reason the Bible is a unity. Christianity grew out of the Old Testament. (3) We need the Old Testament for the doctrine of Providence. The New Testament records a moment, as it were. The Old Testament shows us God through the ages, in nations and in individual lives, choosing and shaping His instruments, working out His purpose generation after generation, selecting and training a people, intervening in affairs, always working towards a great consummation. There is no Providence in the New Testament in any impressive way, no long view, no scheme being wrought out. There is not time. But Providence is one of the supreme, out-thrusting messages of the Old Testament. (4) Finally, we need the Old Testament for a social gospel. The unit in the New Testament is the individual. Personal salvation is its aim. Strictly speaking, apart from inferences, there is no social message in the New Testament. But in the Old Testament we see God's will for a nation. In the prophets the unit is the people, and the gospel is for the people. We have in these great statesmen and reformers the ideal of a nation when God is its Lord. And in an age like ours, when the social element is so emphasized we cannot do without the splendid social critique and ideal of Amos and Isaiah.

That is a preliminary point merely. But the real problems of Old Testament teaching gather round two questions which inevitably rise in the minds of intelligent pupils. The two questions are these: Is it true? And, Is it reasonable? 'It' being in both cases an Old Testament narrative.

(1) *Is it true?* Perhaps the first thing to say in answer is that this question would not have occurred to the writers of the Old Testament histories. Mr. Hugh Martin has reminded us, in *The Meaning of the Old Testament*, that there are three schools of history. One is the scientific

school which is entirely modern, to which the question, Is it true? is paramount. Another is the picturesque school, to which this question is subsidiary. Its real aim is to present a picture of a period, an event, or a person. It may make many mistakes in fact or detail, but its picture is true. Froude is the best example, and in a less degree Macaulay. The third is the ancient school. We cannot say it is indifferent to truth. It states the facts as it conceives them. But its main interest is not the *truth* of facts, but their *meaning*. It is the homiletic school. And to this school the Biblical historian belongs. His real purpose is to show God in events. It would not be too much to say that accuracy in relating them is not a main interest of his. He is far more concerned with their moral and religious significance. History is the movement of God in the world of affairs. What did this event *mean*? How does it reveal God? That was almost exclusively in his mind. We to-day make a sharp distinction between a fact and its significance. I do not think the Biblical historian made this distinction at all. We scrutinize a fact for its evidence. It has to justify itself first as a fact. He made no such scrutiny. His examination was directed to the deeper question of the didactic value of the event. One lesson of this for the teacher of the Old Testament is that our aim ought to be the same as the writer's. He wrote his history to get over to us a message about God and man. We ought not to be content to teach less than he meant to give us. It is the eternal meaning of the Bible events that ought to be the main burden of all teaching in day and Sunday schools. It is here that the weakness of much of the Bible teaching in both lies. Teachers are content to teach what they call the 'facts' of the Bible, not realizing that these are not Bible facts at all. The Bible facts are the events plus their meaning. And when teachers give a skilful lesson on some Bible event, and leave it there—'there' being simply the event minus its message—they are not teaching the Bible at all. I have heard in our day schools Bible lessons taught by excellent teachers, but I have not always heard the *truth* of the Bible taught. The Bible history was not written to inform us about the history of Israel. It was written to show us God in action, God working, God doing things, a living and real God. And we fail miserably when we concentrate on what we call Bible facts, which are not facts at all in the Bible sense. It is for this reason that I venture to say that school examinations in Bible knowledge should be abolished. They concentrate the attention of

teacher and pupil on the externals, on the bare facts which alone are examinable, and help to perpetuate this false method of treating the Bible in school.

(2) In the second place, we must recognize the place of legend in the Old Testament—legend, not myth. Legend has a core of historic fact. Myth is a pure creation of the imagination. I have never been able to comprehend the standpoint of those for whom the existence of legend in the Bible is a difficulty. The Bible is a literature, comprising drama, poetry, letters, biography, proverbs—in short, all forms of literature except epic poetry. Revelation has come to us through all these forms. Why not through legend, which is the earliest form of history among all peoples? There is no more reflection on the divine character of the Bible in its possession of legend than in its possession of drama like Job, or the Song of Songs, or patriotic lays such as some of the Psalms. The first chapter of Genesis is a legend, the history of which we know. But it is one of the most really inspired portions of the Bible. If I were asked to point to a proof of the inspiration of Scripture, I would unhesitatingly give the first chapter of Genesis. When you remember its lowly origin, and see the splendid dignity and spirituality which the Spirit of God has brought to it, you cannot doubt the legitimate place of legend in the Word of God. And if you ask: Is it true? I would answer first: Is what true? The core of it is true. God is behind all the order and beauty of the world. In its detail it is in contradiction to modern science. But it is not a scientific account. It is a religious account. The writer was not concerned about scientific matters at all. All he was concerned about was the revelation of God's creative power in the world. That was what it was written to display. I do not see any reason why this should not be explained to boys and girls of twelve upwards. And it is urgently necessary to explain this. Because they hear in their science classes the story of the earth from the evolutionary point of view. And then in the Bible lesson they hear that the world was made in six days and that the universe is cosmo-centric. And they learn thus to think of the Bible as outworn and untrue.

(3) In the third place, the answer to the question: Is it true? depends largely on the date of the historical narrative. There are sections of the Old Testament history that are contemporary, like much of Samuel and Kings. They were taken from the official chronicles, and are, therefore, in substance reliable. But there are narratives that

are at least a thousand years later than the events they describe. And it is only in a modified sense that historic truth can be ascribed to them. Such are the stories in Genesis, and in a lesser degree those in Chronicles, though Chronicles is largely based on good material. Moreover, it is obvious that stories that circle round a great personality must have been told and retold round the camp fires earlier, and later in tribal gatherings. Such are the stories about Elisha. It is not to be expected that the detail of these tales will be true. They represent idealized history, and there seems to be no reason why this also should not be taught to senior boys and girls, provided they have been sensibly instructed in a sound and true view of the authority of the Bible as the Word of God.

(4) The Old Testament miracles are a problem by themselves. Is it true that the blowing of trumpets caused the walls of Jericho to fall down? that Elisha made an axe head swim on the water? that Elijah caused fire to come down and consume the sacrifice?

Of these Old Testament miracles four things may be said. (a) One is that they are often the providential happening of natural events. Among such events is the crossing of the Red Sea, the damming of the Jordan, the destruction of the cities of the plain by flaming petroleum from heaven, *i.e.* from the air, the provision of manna and quails. All these were natural events. The miracle in them is their happening just when and where they occurred. (b) Another thing to be said is that many of these miracles are just poetical embodiments of spiritual realities. The falling of the walls of Jericho, the feeding of Elijah by ravens, the ascension of Elijah. The last is a very clear instance of what I mean. To take it literally is otiose. The tale is a glorious expression of the triumphant end of a victorious life. (c) The miraculous element in many of the stories of heroes is just the natural and exuberant exaggeration that came to the story of a man's life as it was handed down from generation to generation. So much may be said of the Elisha miracles. And (d) there are well-attested cases of genuine miracle.

Miracle is always a question of evidence. And the difficulty about many of the Old Testament miracles is the distance of the events from the narrative in which they were recorded. But whatever value may attach to the narratives as history, and that is frequently very great, I may repeat a previous point as the one most worth stressing, that it is the truth of a narrative in the Old Testament that matters, and that behind every such event in

the Old Testament is a truth for which it was written and which it is our business as teachers to get over.

2. *Is it reasonable?* Is it reasonable to believe, and teach to children who have been reared on the Gospels, that God ordered the massacre of the men, women, and children of Jericho indiscriminately? Is it reasonable to believe that when the oxen stumbled as they were conveying the ark and there was danger of the ark falling, and Uzzah put out his hand to steady the ark, that God smote him dead? Is it reasonable to believe that, when some mischievous children called a nickname after Elisha, the prophet cursed them and immediately bears came and destroyed a large number of them? I have been reading right through the Bible for the second time in Moffatt's translation, and I have been struck by the large number of passages that exhibit Jehovah as arbitrary and fierce. 'When Jehovah your God brings you into the land and clears it of many a nation, when He puts them into your hands, then you must exterminate them, showing them no mercy.' 'Understand that Jehovah is a God, faithful to those who love him and carry out his orders, and who repays those that hate him by destroying them personally—he never delays with any one who hates him, he repays him personally.' Passages like these are numerous. Is it reasonable to believe literally that God was like that? The fundamentalist must say 'yes.' One of my students was practising and learning teaching in a northern school under a lady teacher. One day the lesson was on Uzzah and the ark, and the teacher gave it as it lay before her in the narrative. After the lesson a small girl came up to her and said, 'Teacher, wasn't that very cruel of God?' To which the helpless teacher replied, 'Well, it's in the Bible, and we have to accept it.' The present headmaster of Rugby School remarks on this subject: 'I am troubled about the average boy's conception of God. It is a strange jumble of Old and New Testament ideas of Him. In the historical books of the Old Testament he sees a supreme ruler who is most conspicuous when he uses force. And often he is represented as using it ruthlessly. He threatens, slays, devastates. He hardens men's hearts and then punishes them because their hearts are hard. He makes terrible examples of not very guilty people. . . . Boys imagine that they are to reconcile such a character with the all-loving Father whom Christ revealed. . . . They do not succeed in this reconciliation, and it is well that they do not succeed, because the two characters ought not to

be combined. The conceptions of God assumed by Old Testament writers are imperfect. Many of them are obsolete. They have great historical interest, because they show how men of old sought the knowledge of God, and how much of it, by stage after stage of discovery, they attained. In the course of these discoveries they were allowed to make mistakes. But the phrases which crystallize these mistakes must not infest the Christian's idea of God, for that conception has been given us by Christ. I doubt if this has been clearly enough explained to boys.' Some illustrations of the effect produced on children's minds by *not* explaining this to them were afforded some time ago by an experiment. The following question was put to children of from eleven to thirteen years of age in schools of different kinds. More than four thousand answers were collected, and Mr. Grigg-Smith has given us many specimens of the answers in his book, *The Child's Knowledge of God*. The question was: 'If a boy tells a lie, and is not found out, will he be punished? If so, give details as to how you think he will be punished.' The emphasis, of course, is on 'is not found out.' Here are some of the replies. 'He thinks he has not been found out,' writes one boy, 'as I thought when I told a lie. I afterwards got severely punished for it. My brother died, and that was how I was punished.' 'God will surely punish him,' writes another, 'either in the form of a serious accident, or death, or his parents might be taken from him while he is only young.' 'God will punish him. When he gets older he will have children and he will be proud of them; so God will perhaps kill his children, and perhaps he will die from the loss of his children, that will be his punishment.' 'They may be going errands for their mothers and have an accident on the way, which really is arranged by God as their punishment.' 'God will punish her. He will perhaps see her crossing a road and get run over by a tram-car. The people will take her to the hospital, not knowing that she has been stealing and that God is punishing her in His own way.' 'He will not always send His punishment in one fashion or at one particular time. Sometimes He will wait till old age is coming on and then send it when you are unable to bear it.' 'The way I think God would pay any one back (*sic!*) is to deceive them in some way or make them unhappy. Jacob deceived his old father, but he got deceived, for when he wanted Rachel he was very sorry when he found he had married her elder sister.' These replies have their pathetically humorous side. As a disclosure of the child's idea of God they

are appalling. But this idea of God came to them directly from the traditional teaching of the Old Testament. 'It is in the Bible, and we must just accept it.' How, then, ought these narratives, and indeed the whole teaching of the Old Testament about God, to be taught? I can only indicate briefly some suggestions without developing them.

(1) We must learn, as the late Professor McFadyen suggested, to distinguish in the Old Testament between fact and interpretation. A very clear example will illustrate this distinction. In 2 S 24¹ we read that 'the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them, saying, Go, number Israel and Judah.' In 1 Ch 21¹ we read that 'Satan stood up against Israel, and moved David to number Israel.' Here we have two interpretations of a single fact. The fact is that David took a census. The earlier writer attributed this to divine inspiration. The later writer, writing hundreds of years afterwards, and writing under the influence of the belief in Satan which had crept into Jewish thought, attributed the act to Satanic inspiration. The two explanations are both theories as to the source of David's act. They cannot both be true. They may both be false. Neither writer could know more than the fact of the census. Now apply this to some of the narratives I have referred to. Uzzah is said to have been struck dead because he touched the ark. The fact here is that Uzzah died. He may have died from heart disease or shock. We do not know. The statement that God killed him is the writer's interpretation. He was wrong, because he was writing at a primitive time, and under the influence of a Semitic idea, which, when unmodified, becomes false. The same is true of Elisha and the bears. The fact is that a dreadful tragedy occurred which must have left a deep mark on the people's memory. That it happened because the children mocked Elisha is an interpretation which we reject, because it is inconsistent with any Christian conception of God.

(2) But that is not enough. How are we to explain the writer's *interpretation* and our rejection of it in a way that will not injure the faith of the child? The answer is the obvious one, that revelation is progressive. Not only is the answer obvious, the truth is obvious. It is a strict deduction from the fact that God revealed Himself in history and through human minds. It is also a direct and inevitable inference from the narratives themselves. Revelation is progressive in the same sense as education is progressive. To say that education is progressive is no reflection on the teacher or the

truth imparted. It is simply a statement that human beings grow in mental, moral, and spiritual capacity. You could not teach the binomial theorem to a child of five, no matter how skilful a teacher you are. The truth is there, and is complete at the beginning of a child's education as at the end. But the child grows in power to receive and assimilate. In the same way God and God's truth were complete and perfect at the beginning of revelation. But God's people were children, infants, naive and gross and elementary, and could only, and did only, receive the truth by slow degrees. The facts I have so often referred to show how slowly they received truth. Let me add a dramatic instance. Samuel found fault with Saul for not killing Agag, sent for the poor creature, and hewed him in pieces 'before the Lord.' Samuel was God's prophet. Centuries later another prophet gave us a different picture of the Servant of the Lord. 'He was bruised for our iniquities. He bore our griefs. The Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all.' Is there no growth between these two pictures? It may be said that the true way to put it is to say that Israel grew in understanding of the revelation, not that the revelation grew. I am quite willing to let it go at that, though it is not strictly true. But the main thing to explain to senior children is that the man who wrote that God struck Uzzah dead did so because he did not know any better. He lived at a period when it was natural for men to think of God as he did. They had not yet outgrown that early arbitrary conception. God was not yet known as He came to be later.

At the same time a warning note has to be struck here. It was not that the thought of God was ever at any time in Israel wholly wrong. There is a great truth contained in every stage of the growth of the idea of God. There is a truth in even the most arbitrary and savage conception. We must not surrender the truth of the sovereignty and righteousness of God, after which the Hebrews were feeling, and which they held to in a rough and exaggerated way. The progressiveness of revelation means that the error and imperfection and exaggeration in the primitive idea were gradually purged away. But it must always be taught that the Hebrews were right in believing that God was righteous in visiting sin with retribution.

In conclusion, I venture to say with special emphasis that nothing I have written makes the Bible any less really the Word of God. It is the human record of how God gradually and ever more clearly made Himself known to man.

The Fourth Commandment.

BY THE REVEREND JAMES REID, D.D., EASTBOURNE.

THE fourth commandment is a natural consequent of those that come before. It demands what we may call a close-time every week, for the cultivation of that relationship with God which is enjoined in the other three. It is designed to prevent, for one day a week, the intrusion of those material interests and concerns which are in constant competition with the interests of the religious life. It is in this way the commandment is to be regarded, and not merely as a system of artificial taboos.

It has become the habit to condemn these prohibitions as being merely negative, and the fourth commandment has been used to authorize the division of time into secular and sacred, which has no basis in reality. All kinds of things, such as buildings, music, and days, have been divided into sacred and secular, with results that are disastrous. The real division between the sacred and the secular is not in things, but in the spirit in which they are employed or enjoyed. The other six days of the week given to work, friendship, and pleasure, should be as sacred as the day which is given to worship. It was for this purpose and with this end in view that the Sabbath rest from ordinary employments was originally enjoined. It was in the interests of the religious life—the life lifted continually into the light of God's purpose and His fellowship—that the Sabbath was established. The precise day is not important. For Christians, the first day of the week, and not the seventh, became the recognized day of worship, in special commemoration of the Resurrection. But it cannot be doubted that the provision of one day in seven, kept free from ordinary employment and set apart for worship, has been the means whereby the level of man's deepest life has been lifted and purified. It was the truest insight into man's spiritual need, in such a world as this, which laid on the Jews this fourth commandment, and has made it binding on the consciences of men throughout the centuries.

It ought to be noted also that this fourth commandment, apart from its provision for religious opportunity, is a humanitarian provision of the first importance. No one can fully realize what benefits it has brought in its train. In these days, when the necessity of leisure from the burden of toil is recognized as never before and is regarded as the birthright of all, it should never be forgotten that

the gift of leisure on Sunday was originally the gift of religion. However people may smile at the ancient enactment, it is the charter of their weekly liberty. The commandment is not a mere dry, forbidding, legal enactment. It breathes the spirit of human compassion. On that day the slave is to be free, and not only he, but the ox and the ass are to have their day of rest. It is not only man's spiritual nature that demands the Sunday, but man's physical nature as well. Religion at its best has always been the guardian of the true life of man.

It is from these points of view—the guarding of one day in seven for the cultivation of the religious life, and for the rest and revival of man's physical energy—that the fourth commandment still has its vital place and its message for to-day. It is as fundamentally binding on our conscience as the law against theft or murder. In practice, it may almost be said to be the key to the keeping of the other nine. Should the Sunday ever be wholly disregarded and its ancient use forgotten, there can be no doubt that there will follow a complete degeneration of life, in which man's enslavement to the world and to his fellows will return in some different, perhaps, but not less deadly form. The necessity for one day in seven, free from ordinary employments, to be devoted to the spiritual needs of life, can never be eradicated from the very constitution of man.

The question that the fourth commandment raises is one which is very urgent at the present time. It is the question of how precisely Sunday, which is our substitute for the Jewish Sabbath, should be spent, if it is to be religiously used. The question arises, of course, only for Christian people. This ought to be clearly realized. If a man is not seeking the highest, the question of what is right or wrong on Sunday has little relevance, for he does not admit the principle by which these may be determined. But when we come to ask how Sunday should be spent, we find little positive help in this commandment. The Jews, in their attempt to keep the letter of it, framed regulations which broke it in the spirit. Jesus Himself deliberately disregarded some of these regulations. When His disciples were hungry, He gathered ears of corn and used them for food, which was forbidden by the code. On the Sabbath also He found a lame man in the Temple and healed him. When an outcry was

raised that He had profaned the Sabbath, He retorted in a principle that delivers us for ever from the tyranny of mere regulations that enjoin what we shall or shall not do on the Sunday. 'The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.' This was but the extension of His method with all the Jewish laws—the substitution of a principle and a spirit by which we may find our own way for regulations that must be mechanically obeyed.

If we are to discover what it means to hallow or consecrate the Sunday, we must take the principle which Christ laid down. The first thing that He makes clear is that the Sunday, like all other gifts of God, must not be regarded as an end in itself. If it is good, it is not merely good in itself; it is good for something, for what it helps man to be or do. It is good as it serves the real end of man's being. Christ judged everything in the world by its effect on men, for in His view the world exists for man and not man for the world. Man is the crown of creation, and all God's gifts are for his enrichment and his perfecting. This judgment of Jesus needs to be applied all round. His judgment of a business is not the profit it produces; it is its effect on those who are engaged in it, and the people whom it serves. His judgment of our pleasures and amusements would be the same. What kind of men and women do they produce in their devotees? Are these better or worse from the point of view of man's true nature? It is by this principle we must judge our way of spending Sunday. Does it make us better men and women from the point of view of Christ's idea of personality?

The Sabbath is for man. But for what kind of man? That is the point. Is it for man as a physical being? Is it for man regarded from the side of his health or his pleasures? The physical side is undoubtedly a factor. Man is a spiritual being, but the physical is part of his nature. One necessity of a complete life is health of body. Jesus never glorified sickness, or taught that an unhealthy body is something which does not matter, much less that it is specially dear to God. A man cannot live a full life whose body is starved for want of fresh air and sunshine. It was to heal a sick man that He broke the Sabbath according to Jewish ideas, and it was the needs of the body that made Him pluck the ears of corn and feed the hunger of His disciples.

From this point of view, Christ would permit all Sunday labour which is vital for health or food, but would ban all other. Everything needs a rest

if it is to keep its life renewed. The most famous green-keeper of the golfing world was an opponent of Sunday golf. He declared that if men did not need a rest on Sunday, the greens did. They tried Sunday labour in munition factories during the War, and they had to give it up. A man is foolish who works on Sunday where the necessity is not vital. In the long-run it does not pay from the point of view of either brain or body.

How much, if any, of Sunday may be given to physical recreation is a question that each must decide for himself. The whole movement of our time is towards greater leisure for such recreations during the week. No one can deny the fact that many of the people who play games on Sunday, for instance, have time enough through the week to give these things a legitimate place, which is all they are entitled to. No one ought himself to work at such a strain or keep others so working, as to make recreation during the week impossible. Nothing needs so much husbandry as our time; and a more spiritual outlook on life would tend more and more so to apportion time, that the Sunday would not need to be stolen from its higher uses for the purpose of mere physical recreation. It is to be noted also that many of our so-called recreations are not recreations at all, but dissipations. They neither tone up the mind nor brace the spirit. They only provide an escape from one material world into another, and that often less elevating.

There is another thing which must be kept in mind. Man is not only a physical being; he is also a social being. He has responsibility towards others. Nothing that we do must involve the injury of others, or deprive them of their rights for the sake of our privileges. It does not matter in the slightest whether they want to work or not on Sunday. Many a man will work on that day if he is well paid for it. But few of those who have to work on Sunday like to do it. Members of the musical and theatrical professions dislike Sunday labour and are opposed to it. No man who is concerned about the rights of others will seek to widen the range of necessary labour.

But deeds of voluntary social service would fall within the scope of Sunday employment. Christ made that clear by His own act on the Sabbath day. Various forms of social service, the moral and spiritual instruction of young people, are acts to which He would give His blessing. For these are things that make for the true welfare, not only of those who are helped, but also of those who give their service. The deliberate exercise of these social sympathies in practical service is essential to

our true development, apart from the good that we may do. And for that, Sunday provides for many people a real opportunity. Even if a busy man use Sunday for rest to his own mind and body that he may be the more efficient for his work on the other six days, he is missing something vital to his own spirit if this social side of his nature finds no outlet.

But the deepest truth of man's being is that he is spiritual. He is a spirit, and his soul is the root of all that is fine in his life. When the soul dies, everything else loses its true vitality. When the life of the spirit decays, everything else fades. We cannot keep a world even healthy in body without the health of the spirit, any more than we can keep a plant healthy where we do not care for the roots. It is in the quality of our souls that we are most of all deficient. A business cannot be run without soul, though many may try. Business men will admit that many of their worst troubles are due to the lack of honesty, trust, and faithfulness—the things that depend on the quality of the inner life. If we think of our industrial life, it is the soul which is defective there. How are we to get the new world for which we long? Only as men are changed within, can the world be renewed without. The world to-day is in the condition in which it is, because it is bankrupt of spiritual capital. It is the life of the soul that counts, and the soul lives only by its contact with God. The late Lord Acton, who knew more of history than any other man of his time, wrote thus to one of his correspondents: 'Deny God, and whole branches of deeper morality lose their sanction.' When Christ said that the Sabbath was made for man, He was thinking most deeply of man as a child of God. It is that relationship, found and maintained, which is the secret of all that is vital in life.

How, then, shall we spend Sunday? No one can dictate to another. Is it right to amuse ourselves? Is it wrong to play a game of golf? The answer to this question depends on our own spirit and outlook. Christ's view of right and wrong was inward, not outward. He did not look on the thing we are doing, but on the heart. We are wrong when we are living in a wrong relationship with God. Is our attitude to God the attitude of Jesus—the attitude of a son living in fellowship with His Father? If we are right there, and the things we think of doing on Sunday do not disturb our relation with God and can be taken up into fellowship with Him, then our question is answered. But if we are living in the son's fellowship with the Father, seeking His will, we shall very soon find out what it is right to do on Sunday. That is the

guiding principle. Get right with God and everything else will fall into its true place. If we keep our own soul sensitive to Him, we shall have the inner light which is the only principle of guidance. We shall be free, not to do as we please, but in the sense that all we do will be done out of love for Him. One thing is sure. If we are living in fellowship with the God whom Jesus revealed, we shall be on our guard lest things like sport and amusement become the masters of life and not its servants, and claim more than their rightful place among its interests. Bread is necessary, but Christ warned us that man shall not live by bread alone, and He went hungry many a time when the higher interest of life claimed His mind and strength. He was always master of the house of His soul, and nothing was allowed to dull the relationship between Him and His Father. Prayer is as necessary as bread, if a man is to live in Christ's sense of the word. The soul must have its time of recreation as well as the body, if we are not to sink to that low level which is the death of everything, because it is the death of the spirit.

This day my Saviour rose,
And did inclose this light for His;
That, as each beast his manger knows,
Man might not of his fodder misse.
Christ hath took in this piece of ground,
And made a garden there for those
Who want herbs for their wound.

This verse of George Herbert brings us to the one use of Sunday which is vital. It is this that the fourth commandment makes clear. The true consecration of Sunday is its use for the special purpose of worship. In that act of devotion, where we give ourselves up with all our souls alert to listen to God's voice within and to bow down in adoration before His glory revealed in Christ, there is an opportunity which nothing else can give for making contact with Him. It is true to say that all life should be worship; but will people worship at all if their souls be not lifted up to God, and their ear be not sensitive to His voice once a week at least? It is true to say that all the world is a temple, and we should find God everywhere. But have we any assurance that people will see God anywhere, not to speak of everywhere, whose eyes are not fixed once a week at least on things invisible? In that splendid picture which the Apocalypse gives of the Holy City, which is the outline, in crude colours perhaps, of the ideal life after which we are striving, we have it stated that there was no temple therein. It is a city without a church. But the rest of the picture makes it

plain that its streets were streets of gold. That is the point. Are our houses of business halls of pure and lofty fellowship? Is our life together always so elevating that we are kept up to our best, and our minds constantly inspired by what is good and true? There is something degrading and coarsening to the spirit, as things are, in ordinary business and amusement. One of our writers talks about what he calls 'the hypnotism of the streets'; and the phrase is true. Our whole world is materialized and materializing. Its artificial glamour, its vulgar advertisement, make constant appeal to what is selfish in us. The world is so organized on the side of materialism that we cannot escape from its clutch without deliberately seeking to cut ourselves free. It is that detachment which Sunday worship provides. It is the opportunity to close the door that we may become aware of the spiritual and eternal. We must take means to give the thought of God and His truth and love a chance to possess our being. It is that which the fourth commandment demands.

There is a principle behind this injunction which ought to be laid hold of. God is seeking to make Himself known, and if we are quiet enough to give Him opportunity, He will become a reality. The spiritual world will break in. The spiritual instinct which is a part of every man's nature will assert itself. God is unreal to many people because they are never quiet enough and still enough to become aware of Him. The religious instinct is often thwarted and buried beneath the pressure and burden of life with its constant rush and strain. But it is there, and in various ways it makes its presence felt. The sense of disillusionment, of frustration, the feeling of misgiving and despair, which lie like a blight on many a heart, reveal this lack of harmony with life. The very demand for

more pleasure and amusement is often the craving to escape from this inward conflict and unrest. The sad tale of nervous instability and various forms of breakdown is a commonplace. The reason is that in many cases the spiritual world has been shut out, and Nature has revolted in this loss of mental stability and inward peace. We have created a world which we have no power to control, and the result is that we are in danger of being destroyed by it. Where this process will end no one can say. But the first step back to peace is through the quietness in which for a time the world is shut out, that man may find God and be found of Him, and so regain the power to be truly master of the world. The interests of the world make for death, St. Paul tells us; the interests of the spirit mean life and peace. We grow in life, as a well-known philosopher has reminded us, in the measure in which our interests are more and more detached from the material, and are rooted in the spiritual. Our true joy in life and our power over the world come from the control of God within. And for this we need to cultivate the mood of detachment. The quietness in which we find contact with God may be difficult to attain at first. Our ears are so full of the clamour of the world that we can hear little of the voice of His Spirit. Many people have lost the power to be quiet and to concentrate on the unseen and eternal. The effort to worship is like trying to listen to the music of some fine orchestra amid the babble of a crowd. At first we can only catch a note or two, here and there. But gradually the ear becomes more sensitive as it strives to listen, and bit by bit the music takes control, and comes to fill the mind with its melody. The value of Sunday is to provide the opportunity for this quietness. It offers us the chance to be still and know that God is, and that He is waiting to be gracious.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The 'Queen Mary's' Message:

'I am following my course, full speed.'

By THE REVEREND P. N. BUSHILL, B.A.,
ORPINGTON.

'None of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy.'—Ac 20th.

I SUPPOSE everybody in Britain has been interested in the sailing of the *Queen Mary*. I am not going

to waste my time by giving you particulars of the size and accommodation of the boat—the number of miles of wire and cable, the size of the funnels, the number of decks, and so on: for one thing, you probably know much more about this than I do! But I want to remind you of that broadcast to schools which took place from the ship when she was in mid-Atlantic on her maiden voyage to America. You remember you heard Commodore Sir Edgar Britten, the Captain, and Mr. Llewellyn,

the Chief Engineer, and of course the B.B.C. commentator who introduced them to us and explained all sorts of things to us. Then do you remember, at the conclusion, the booming of the *Queen Mary's* siren—that deep majestic note? The commentator told us that she was not only saying 'Farewell' to us, but was speaking a message which those versed in ships' signals could well understand, and the message was, 'I am following my course, full speed.' That was a fine message for the ship to give to boys and girls.

We must first know our course, if we are to follow it. The *Queen Mary's* course was quite clear. It was the Captain's first duty to bring the vessel safely from Southampton, *via* Cherbourg, to New York. Everything else on board ship had to be subject to that main purpose. There were all sorts of games on board ship, there was the comfort of the passengers to attend to, there were meals to provide of extraordinary variety, but all these were minor matters in comparison with the main purpose of the voyage. The *Queen Mary* had a definite course to take. Have you a course in life? Many people seem to go through life without any settled course at all—like ships sailing on the ocean without chart or compass. But you have a course, haven't you? What is it, I wonder? Many, I suppose, would say that it is from earth to heaven. Yes, but God wants us to take the right course through life. Paul had a course in life to take, but all through that course he had one supreme purpose in view. What was it? He tells us: 'That with all boldness Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or by death.' That is a fine purpose for you to have, boys and girls, a fine course for you to take—that you will do nothing mean or untrue, and that all through your life Jesus Christ may be glorified by your words and deeds day by day.

The broadcast message from the *Queen Mary* brought us another lesson, and that is that we must continually set our course. When Sir Edgar Britten spoke from the bridge he said that he had just previously been engaged on one of the most important duties he had, that was the fixing of the position of the ship. A boat has all sorts of things to contend with; currents of the mighty deep can move mighty vessels out of their course, even strong winds persistently blowing can affect the course. Continually it is necessary, with the most modern instruments, to find the exact latitude and longitude of the vessel, thus to see that she is

keeping her course. There are also many things that take us out of our course in life, if we are not very careful: strong currents, like the force of evil temptations; powerful winds, like the advice of our companions and friends. We need continually to set our course, so that we shall not be moved aside. God has given us Sunday each week to help us in setting our course: but once a week is not enough; every day, and continually, we need to fix our position, and ask God to help us to keep our right course. Read the words of the text again: Paul was leaving Ephesus, and his course took him to Jerusalem, but friends wanted to dissuade him because he might have to suffer there: what did he say? 'None of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy.'

Then, full speed ahead, when on the right course. How lovely it must be to command a vessel to go 'full speed' across the broad waters of the ocean! No built-up areas there! No speed limits! Just as fast as ever you can! So different here on our roads and lanes: why, we cannot even cycle full speed here! That was the *Queen Mary's* signal, 'full speed.' But it must be on the right course. If, perchance, some mistake had been made, and the ship were out of her course, then the faster she went the more grievous the mistake would have been. There are some people who go full speed in the wrong direction—use clever inventions to wage war, spend long hours plotting evil. Be sure that you are on the right course, and then 'full speed.' Don't slacken: don't think things are easy. Sometimes a great athlete has lost his prize because he has been over-confident, and just for a moment slackened speed. There must be no hesitancy, no looking back, no slackening of effort in the Christian life.

Then there is the end of the course. Great was the excitement in New York when the *Queen Mary* arrived. She had accomplished the main purpose of the voyage, which was not to break records, but to land the passengers safely in New York. We have mentioned Paul several times; well, when he was quite old, he wrote to Timothy: 'I have finished my course, I have kept the faith.' And you boys and girls, in many, many years' time, will also have the joy of being able to say the same thing, if you can truthfully adopt the message of the *Queen Mary* as your own, 'I am following my course, full speed.'

The Church that is like a Cross.

BY THE REVEREND D. T. DAVIES, M.A., B.D.,
LONDON.

'Behold the pattern of the altar of the Lord.'—
JOS 22²⁸.

The writer of the last book of the Bible tells us that in the Holy City he saw no temple, that is, no church. To-day we can hardly think of any big city without a noted church in the centre of it. There is Edinburgh with St. Giles, Dublin with St. Patrick's, while no one can be long in Paris without seeing the great cathedral, Notre Dame.

In London we have two great churches which share the glory of fame, St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey. Not long ago St. Paul's was half closed, because the workmen were busy making strong the pillars beneath the big dome, but we can have the run of the Abbey. Now, girls and boys, suppose we visit this sacred bit of England, with its tall twin towers, which stands across the road from Big Ben, whose loud booms you have often heard on the 'Wireless.' Once inside, there are two things that claim our notice. The one is the plan of the Abbey. It is built in the shape of a *cross*. The other is the fact that so many of the great and noble men of the past lie buried within its walls. These are not buried anywhere or anyhow, but after a fitting and well-thought-out order.

As you know, the main point in a cross is the head or centre, then come the right and left arms, with the foot or the base at the bottom. In Westminster Abbey the tombs of kings and queens are found at the head of the cross; even from as early a time as that of Edward the Confessor. Everything here reminds us of the throne of England, notably the ancient chair with the Stone from Scone, in which the sovereigns have been crowned for centuries.

If I were to ask you which hand you use to throw a ball or swing a club most of you would reply, 'Right hand.' This is the hand of strength. We are not surprised, therefore, that the *right* side of the Abbey has been set apart for the names of great statesmen like Pitt, Peel, Gladstone, and others. They had to do with the making of our laws, the Acts of Parliament, which have behind them the power of the Empire.

Turning our gaze towards the left side, we come to an interesting part, namely, the 'Poets' Corner.' How often after a cross-country run, or a hurried scamper to catch a train, you have felt something beating rapidly on your left side. This is the place

of the heart—the place that befits such names as those of Shakespeare, Burns, Tennyson, Longfellow, and Browning, they who have written of the things of the heart, of love and joy and beauty. Next we come to the nave or middle part of the building, which stretches down to the main door at the bottom end. Again we stand upon holy ground, because here are memorials of the great benefactors, pioneers, inventors, doctors, who have found a way to ease pain and so make life happier and more safe for us. Last of all, at the point which may be called the base of this cross-shaped fabric, we come to the graves of David Livingstone and the Unknown Soldier, two mighty men of valour who laid down their lives, not only in service, but in sacrifice for their fellows.

Yet the Abbey was built in honour of One who is greater than all these. Its pattern is taken from that 'green hill far away, without a city wall,' where Jesus Christ won a victory, the fruits of which He is willing to share with us. Because, to follow the Christ as King of our life is to be given the right hand of power to conquer temptation, the kind and tender heart to feel for others and to show it in the doing of good turns for the sake of men and unto the glory of God.

The Christian Year.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Second Deliverance.

'For thou hast delivered my soul from death: wilt not thou deliver my feet from falling, that I may walk before God in the light of the living?'—Ps 56¹².

Now and then a time arrives in life when some strain is lightened or lifted from us. Whether it is the recovery of an individual from illness, or the end of some business anxiety, or the release of a nation from the tension of war, we enjoy it, this calm after the storm, this relaxation after days of critical pressure. But we are not always the better for it; morally the better. People are too apt to let themselves go and to throw off restraints, as they feel that life is once more in their own hands. All but the best are likely to be the worse for a period of reaction.

'Our critical day,' Dr. John Donne remarks, 'is not the very day of our death, but the whole course of our life. I thank him that prays for me when the bell tolls, but I thank him much more that catechises me or preaches to me or instructs me how to live.' That is precisely how the Psalmist

felt, more than twenty centuries before Donne, when he wrote this prayer for the second deliverance: 'Thou hast delivered my soul from death: wilt not thou deliver my feet from falling, that I may walk before God in the light of the living?' He, too, had realized that our critical day is the whole course of our life.

Here's a man upon whom the serious things of life have not been wasted. Who he was, and when he wrote, we cannot tell. But that is no matter. What does matter is that he has learned one of the deep lessons of life, namely, that we need God as much for the hours of light and movement as we do for the hours of darkness. That may sound obvious. In theory it is, but do we not know how easy it is to forget the truth of it in actual life? When the sharp hour is over and relief arrives, we who had called upon the Lord urgently will now proceed to behave as though we could manage for and by ourselves *in the light of the living*. Were we honest, we would confess that at heart we really do not believe there is the same need of prayer in health and smooth hours as in the desperate situation. But there is! I have regained my health, says the Psalmist, I have recovered my stride, but I do require God as much as ever I did. He has given life back to me, and only He can show and help me to use this gift aright, to *walk before Him* instead of strolling or straying over the course. To *walk before God* was a Hebrew phrase for living ever mindful of the Lord, conscious of Him as our standard and strength.

Not that one can be always thinking of God. His Spirit rules our lives even when His name is not on our lips. We do not invariably turn to the sun in whose light we do our work. But the consciousness of God pervades the religious soul.

A prayer like this takes issue at once with one popular and easy creed of to-day, the creed that whatever is natural is right. Life is swarming with impulses, we are told; obey them, enjoy them; walk before the shadow of your own wonderful self, and let its changing variety of instincts and appetites be enough to direct you, instead of cramping yourself by following any so-called rule of God; if you repress or thwart an impulse, you suffer for it. Now religion is most natural, but what we call 'natural' is not always religious. Not by any means. There have been indeed unwise repressions in the sphere of religion; nevertheless, character in manhood and womanhood depends upon the mastery of impulses. Otherwise we never become mature.

Then again, short of this, there is the tendency,

even among good and well-meaning people, to forget the need of the second deliverance. When preparing young people for their first communion, I used to be struck by the admission of some that they said prayers at night, but not in the morning. Not because they were too hurried in the morning, they agreed, when one pressed them for a reason, but because they had the notion that they could look after themselves in the daytime, whereas at night they had to depend more upon God. Perhaps the spirit of this mistake is not confined to young folk. Certainly it is a danger present to the minds of thoughtful Christians. Charles Wesley knew what he was doing when he wrote this prayer for us to sing:

Plenteous grace with Thee is found,
Grace to cover all my sin;
Let the healing streams abound;
Make and keep me pure within.

'Make,' you see, '*and keep* me pure within,' after the first deliverance. We sing:

Through cloud and sunshine, O abide with me;

and if we sang with the understanding we would realize the deep significance of Lyte's line. He did not add 'and sunshine' to fill out the line with a neat phrase. He wanted us to realize precisely what the Psalmist felt in his prayer for the second deliverance, namely, that we require the presence of God to meet the sunshine no less than the cloud. The one may be as critical as the other.

Life is, indeed, so much more difficult than most of us, in the flush of regained power, are willing to allow. Even when we honestly mean to go straight, there are many risks of failure. Consider how difficult it is, *in the light of the living*, for example, with the needs of human life so clearly cut, even to be just and kind wisely. We may be disposed to think that it only requires a good heart to be fair to our fellows or to handle them in a kind way; but justice is far from being a simple thing, and so is kindness. The good intention is something, but it is by no means everything. Wisdom and patience are required; otherwise a project may go wrong. Even to give money or advice is in many cases a far more intricate and exacting matter than in our impulsive moments we realize. We do require God to guide us, even when we are thoroughly alive to our duties. If we become self-sufficient, then life lies open to many a blunder. Start without prayer, even on some line of good intention, and there is no guarantee

against mishandling the very objects of our aid. For prayer implies the thoughtful reference of life to God's wisdom.

Again, there is the subtlety of sin to be reckoned with. The plain fact is that a bad habit will start up, long after we had overcome it, as we thought, or temptations may change their form from youth to middle age, and unless we are watchful and praying we may fall into inconsistency and error, as we forget to hold life steadily in the form of a responsibility from God.

Especially, our Psalmist feels, there is the risk attending any intense experience of the soul. 'Thou hast delivered my soul from death.' Fill that up as we may, the point is that when the high moment passes we encounter a phase of less acute emotion than the thrilling or painful emergency provided. But here is where the staying power of our religion comes into play. Let us put it in this way. Religion is more affection than emotion, thank God, and therefore, while our emotions vary in intensity, there's no reason why our affections should. Our loyalty of will may be and should be steady, whatever happens to our feelings. Reaction is a phase of our being, and we need not be afraid of it. All we need to fear is lest our religion rests upon feelings rather than upon the deep affections which are like tides running beneath the foam of the surface. We cannot hope always to feel as we do in the tense moments of existence. When the crisis passes, it may leave us limp and listless; but then we are summoned to keep our eyes steadily upon the great objects that call out faith and fidelity. At least we can recall the insight we once had, the keener vision of what life is and is meant to be, the direct and vivid experience of the Lord's delivering hand. Let moods come and go. But never, never let our affections waver. They will be acceptable to God when they are no longer glowing, provided that they are binding us constantly to His good and gracious will.

'Watch and pray,' Jesus told His disciples, when He realized far more than they did how much need they had to be upon the alert against themselves. 'Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall,' said the great Apostle. And, before our Lord and the Apostle, our Psalmist said much the same thing, and he is saying it still to ourselves, teaching us to-day to pray this wise and humble prayer of long ago: 'Thou hast delivered my soul from death: wilt not thou deliver my feet from falling, that I may walk before thee in the light of the living?'¹

¹ J. Moffatt, *His Gifts and Promises*, 30.

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Pan more deadly than Mars.

'The forest devoured more people that day than the sword devoured.'—2 S 18^a (R.V.).

That statement is taken from one of the vivid battle scenes which the Old Testament writers were such adepts at describing.

We, too, are painfully, personally, and practically aware of the fact enunciated here, that the accompaniments and consequences of war can be far more disastrous than the actual fighting. It is the unexpected that happens, the unlooked-for that piles up the casualties. It was the place of shelter that shattered: the green sward was grimmer than the grey sword. One would never think that those pleasant woods of Ephraim would turn traitor—the orchard-closes of home. They afford some of the most charming woodland scenery that Syria knows. From noble oaks standing in luxuriant grass shot with a rich variety of wild flowers, the wood-pigeons rise in clouds, and jays and woodpeckers flash and chatter in every glade.

Of the battle of life, also, it is true that the forest devours more people than the sword devours. The *Odyssey* of life is as long and tragic a tale in its way as the *Iliad*. The old Greeks showed their knowledge of the fact that the wood can be as dangerous as the sword, when Homer makes Odysseus inquire: 'Did all those Achæans return safe with their ships, or perished any by a shameful death aboard his own ship, or in the arms of his friends, after he had wound up the clew of war?' This is the universal experience of the race; and they have hidden the warning in their tales.

'Some people's sins are evident,' says St. Paul, 'leading the world to an estimate of their characters, but the sins of others lag behind.' That is the Apostle's way of stating the too familiar truth that, although there are some notorious cases in which people fall openly in the sight of the world, cut down by the sword of the enemy, there are far more who succumb in the dark and hidden depths of the forest, unmarked by the public gaze.

One of the old commentators, taking the word 'devour' literally, explains that the fate which those who fled to the forest for refuge met with was to be devoured by the wild animals it sheltered. And readers of Dante will recall how he opens his great drama by representing himself as suddenly, when half-way through life, finding himself in

the midst of a dark wood infested with wild beasts.

In the midway of this our mortal life,
I found me in a gloomy wood, astray,
Gone from the path direct: and e'en to tell,
It were no easy task, how savage wild
That forest, how robust and rough its growth,
Which to remember only, my dismay
Renews, in bitterness not far from death.

And he tells how he encountered first a panther, and then a lion, and then a she-wolf, and how each successive encounter exposed him to fresh danger. That is Dante's way of telling us the same story and giving us the same warning. He found that it was in the mid-years of life that a man is apt to fail and succumb. Having escaped the violent edge of the sword—the more flagrant sins, he was in danger of going down before either the panther or the lion or the she-wolf—that is to say, before luxury, before pride, or before avarice.

The danger for most of us, especially those in the mid-years of life, all the experts seem to be agreed, is that we should become entangled in that which lured us to enter it at first because it looked attractive, and seemed to offer us a means of shelter and a way of escape in the battle of life. It may be something which in itself is innocent enough at first, but which proves our undoing if it come to entangle us so that it prevents us from going onward and upward.

It is just the tragedy of to-day that the forest devours more than the sword, that so many are lost to the cause of Christ and the Kingdom of God through no open sin, but just through entanglement with what our Lord called 'the worry of the world and the lure of riches.' We are being devoured of the wood if our own hearts condemn us that we are not so sensitive to the voices of the Spirit as once we were. If we are content with second-bests and unworthy compromises; if we have lost the edge of our appetite for the beautiful and noble things after which we used to hunger and thirst; if we are conscious of having lowered our standards of reverence, or of rectitude, or of morality; if we must admit to ourselves that we are not so punctilious in the observance of religious duties as once we were, then the forest has us in thrall. Our danger is not that we should be guilty of pursuing unworthy ends, but that we should fail of man's chief end, which is to glorify God.

The words in which the story of Absalom's fatal entanglement is told contain one of the grimmest pieces of irony to be found in the whole of Scripture.

'And Absalom rode upon his mule, and the mule went under the thick boughs of a great oak, and his head caught hold of the oak, and he was taken up between the heaven and the earth; and the mule that was under him went on.' The man got stuck behind, and his beast went on without him! The city is full of stories like that, of men of great ability and great promise, whose very gifts became their undoing. Their latter end was emptiness—hanging in mid-air; and the business that was under them went on.

A French writer on Pascal has said that Christ has two great enemies, the god Priapus and the god Pan, and that of the two the latter is the more deadly. That is to say, that one can vanquish sensuality in its ugliest forms, but the easy-going idea that everything should be taken as it comes, and that nothing is really more important than anything else, is death to all moral earnestness and to all Christian endeavour.

And that is why it behoves those of us who care at all for the well-being of the nation's soul to resist all the insidious attempts which are being repeatedly made in so many quarters to filch from us the safeguards of spiritual life which have been handed down from the fathers. For we owe everything that we possess of iron in our will and of salt in our character to that old discipline which guarded the outposts because they were the King's territory as much as the citadel.¹

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Deliverance and Witness.

'The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.'—Ro 8¹⁶.

No other form of literature carries the same authority as does sincere autobiography. The person who writes sincerely about himself deals at first hand and without rival with raw fact. Even here, if his story implicates others, there is possibility of more than one angle of vision, and therefore of more than one version of the account. But when a person turns a trained, candid mind upon the inner processes of his own life he is developing a theme where no rival authority can ever compete.

Now a record of the inner life may be either very dull or more thrilling than any tale of hairbreadth escapes. Some persons, perhaps the great majority, follow their type, alike in their virtues and in their vices. Even their periods of turbulence are accounted for by their age or their breeding or their circumstances. A candid and well-told account of

¹ H. L. Simpson, *The Nameless Longing*, 156.

any inner life-voyage would have some interest, but when there is movement, not circular and repetitive, but progressive and controlled, and demonstrating the victory of the spirit over its environment, there is no romance so thrilling as such a record of fact. In sixty verses Paul tells the epic story of his spirit's defeat and deliverance, suffering and victory. He switches the searchlight of his critical genius within and exposes his spirit naked for the warning and guidance of a world. It is a great, dignified judgment upon life, and as we read it something within us whispers, 'Yes, that is true, I too have felt it but dared not put it into words.' These self-critics, like Paul here and Bunyan in *Grace Abounding*, are the pioneers of the spiritual life. They make us realize that life is not a residence where consistency and docility are the major virtues, but an adventure where we must follow the right way in preference to the accepted way.

The story begins with a soul enslaved by a law on the one hand, and a body on the other—two jailers who are also at enmity with each other. The attempt to come to terms with rules and regulations has never been satisfactory. Between his active ego which he calls the flesh, but which we would call his psyche or ego-personality, and that rigid set of incorruptible laws, Paul's spirit was broken and defeated. If we have not tasted the same bitterness it is probably because our tastes are perverted until we can no longer make radical discriminations. High desires tugging against low deeds demand a wider arena than a human soul; they tear its walls by their conflict; and Paul, alive to it as we are not, cried out, 'Who shall deliver me?' Now, if we feel that he makes much ado about nothing, if we conclude that our condition before God does not matter so much as our standing at the Bank, then all that follows will only faintly interest us. We may study it detachedly as the psychologist studies the dreams of a dog. Whereas if we feel that Paul here pictures a crisis that is real, and therefore terrible, we shall welcome his thrill of deliverance and his joyful entrance into spiritual society.

1. From defeat and despair God delivered him through Jesus Christ. This living soul was saved by contact with a life that was free from his sins, but sharing with him a power and liberty that made him free. The law that had crushed him was a law that operated by penalty—a law of sin and death. This life that he shared was not lawless; the difference was that the new law was contributory to life and growth and fellowship. The

old law was of the earth, this was of the air. Air and earth are both necessary to human life, but we breathe the air and we tread upon the earth. Paul learned to breathe the air of God. It carried to him the life and vigour of Christ. He entered into Christ as we enter a new country, and on his entry he said, 'There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after earth, but after the air.' There is a test for every one of us—not external or ecclesiastical or credal, but just the steady in-breathing of the atmosphere of Christ.

2. Through deliverance he came to kinship. As many as are led by the Spirit of God are the Sons of God. Tasting God's life, breathing God's air, one enters the Divine Society. You are a son, with a Father; not a lonely orphan impaled on a pointed law, but a member of a family. You have intercourse with God, and become possessed of the mind and will that were alive in Him.

3. How can we be sure of this? Paul was certain—therein lay his power—but can we translate his testimony into terms of our own experience? Paul advances a proof for our testing. It is the proof of corroborative testimony. The mutual bearing of witness is a very common proceeding in our daily life. Indeed, it takes place in every conversation. It provides the spice of friendship. We discuss a cricketer or a politician or a flower-bed, and find that we share certain judgments or tastes or delights or antipathies. We hold our convictions more happily when some one else witnesses to them.

Women going shopping compare their views on colour, materials, designs, prices—corroborate each other's taste—bear witness together. The scholar seeks authoritative witness in mathematics, history, language, or philosophy, and when by systematic comparison he is made worthy he enters the family. There is something like that in our spiritual pilgrimage. We look at life, especially our own attempt at it, in God's company. This involves, of course, our willingness to change our mind if we discover that our mind has been wrong. When His witness confirms our guess then our guess becomes a certainty, and many a joyous intuition lying shy and dusty in a corner is brought forth and polished and made confident and vocal by the witnessing Spirit of Christ. That Spirit, shining through His words, His life, His passion, witnesses to the depths of our nature, and makes life a great jocund adventure in friendship. It is this life of the Divine Society that Jesus pictures when He says, 'Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God.'

Other helps there are, and we should use them all.

There are our contemporaries and sharers in Church fellowship; their witness is humanly conditioned and fallible, but very precious. There are outstanding heroic characters, whose spirit leaps across the chasm of years, of temperament and of fashion, to greet and encourage us. There is worship which transcends its bounds of usage and tradition to caress and impel the soul. There is Nature, breaking the bounds of struggle and fear to speak to the poetic soul. All these help select individuals in various ways, but this that Paul presses upon our notice is a way for every one—mystic, poet, man of affairs—the apostolic way of direct access. Life is lonely, perilous, individual; the hosts of darkness compass thee around and make inroads within. God-in-Christ comes within, banishes the darkness and fear, and sets up the Divine family.

Our minds, overblown by many winds, are often astonishingly unaware of the Divine approach. Are we willing to forsake loneliness and the unequal contest with law? To live life in consultation with God, to banish guilty secrecy and conspiracy, to live in the Divine Society and then create the Divine Society upon earth? ¹

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Arrested by Christ Jesus.

'May apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus.'—Ph 3¹³.

These expressions, 'apprehended,' 'laid hold of,' carry with them the suggestion of sudden arrest. They recall the oft-told and never-to-be-forgotten experience of Saul of Tarsus on the road to Damascus, when the Lord laid hold of him and changed the whole direction of his life. For that very reason, we may wonder whether we can use such language of ourselves. Sudden conversions have until recently been rather rare and out of fashion. Most of us are not conscious of having been arrested or captured in any such fashion. Whether with regret or with relief, we incline to say, Christ has not laid hold of me, has not apprehended me. Perhaps we draw this conclusion too hastily. It may be that His hand has been laid on us, though we are not aware of it. On reflection we may find that men who are conscious of no debt to Christ are yet under obligation to Him, and that every honest autobiography would require at least a section entitled 'What I owe to Christ.'

Again and again, in the things men take for granted, particularly in their ideals, they show

¹ J. Rutherford, *Key Words*, 115.

themselves to be apprehended of Christ Jesus. Thus no decent or honourable young man or woman contemplates the engagement of marriage without desiring to offer wife or husband a lifelong loyalty. Many young people, who would never profess or call themselves Christian, yet affirm the worth and beauty of Christ's ideal of marriage.

Let us consider a more far-reaching example of the permeating influence of Jesus. Not so very long ago members of the Adult School Movement were invited to answer the question, What is religion? There was silence in one school when this conundrum was propounded. At length, one of the members, an engineer, hazarded a reply. 'I should say, kindness was my religion. I feel I ought to be kind, and I feel ashamed when I lose my temper, even if it is only with the cat.'

The inadequacy of such a definition is undeniable. Kindness may be a soft sentimental thing, of little religious or moral value. To get at the nature of religion, we should have to probe the implications of my friend's sense of obligation and accompanying sense of shame. But the reason that others of us hesitated to give such a definition was not that we felt it inadequate, but that it was so obvious as to go without saying. Why do we rate kindness so high and put it so near the heart of our religion?

The historic truth of the matter is accurately expressed in a work of art, 'The Woman of Andros.' If one had asked for a definition of religion in Greece in the Hellenistic age, it is not likely that any one would have given the answer—kindness. This is the way in which Mr. Thornton Wilder depicts the position. He describes a woman on a Greek island, who follows the strange and dubious profession of an hetaira. Herself a social outcast, she feels pity for the weak and crippled, and realizes that this sentiment is not endorsed by the society in which she lives. She gathers round her failures of all descriptions. It is regarded as foolishness, as indeed it has generally been regarded in most ancient non-Christian civilizations.

Then you have the woman's conflicting prayers for the young man Pamphilus who has caught most of her spirit of compassion, and whose very name implies humanitarian sentiment. She prays that he may be released from the burden of pity, and then that he may be confirmed in his insight. 'Let him rest some day, O Olympians, from pitying those who suffer. Let him learn to look the other way. This is something new in the world, this concern for the unfit and the broken. Once he begins that, there's no end to it, only madness. It leads nowhere. That is some god's business.'

The full significance of the author's closing sentence lies in its relation to this problem. 'And in the East the stars shone tranquilly down upon the land that was soon to be called holy, and that even then was preparing its precious burden.' The whole suggestion of Thornton Wilder's book is essentially true. Instinctive kindness lies deep in human nature. It belongs to that something of God which we may believe to be in every man, something that anticipates Christ; something that welcomes Him. But it needed the coming of Jesus, His teaching, His story, His suffering to make this consideration for others, this care for the poor and broken, central or nearly central, if not in our religion, at least in our thought of religion, in the West. That kindness should be so central in our thought of religion is a sign that He has laid His hand upon us.

Loisy, whose judgment no competent scholar would lightly put aside, maintains that our modern humanitarianism is really rooted in Christianity. 'The best thing in modern societies is the feeling for humanity which has come to us from the gospel and which we owe to Christianity.'

If, then, we to-day regard all men as our brothers, hope and work for the solidarity of mankind, we owe it primarily to Christ. He has apprehended us, arrested us. We are under obligation to Him, whether we like it or not. But, the debt once acknowledged, need we dwell on it? We must not live in the past, we may be thankful for all or for much that the past has given us, but, as Elizabeth Barrett Browning wrote, we cannot halt for thankings on the threshold ever more. We must act in the living present, and not be constantly dwelling on the influences which have shaped us from the past, but rather concentrate on the fresh resources and new tasks that are ours—in short, on what is modern.

Yes, this attitude would be completely justified if we might assume that we had realized St. Paul's ideal, absorbed all that Christ came to make possible for us, if we might believe that this guiding and controlling sense of humanity had become a second nature, or if we have found for it other and better supports than the influence and faith of Jesus. But can we confidently affirm any such assumption?

There is a remarkable passage in Bousset's *What is Religion?* which seems to raise and clear this issue, though not exactly as Bousset himself intended it. At one point he sketches in the figures of Goethe and Bismarck as representing two modern ideals in the realm of culture and politics, with a satisfying completeness. He points out how impossible it is to appreciate these great figures and formative

influences of modern history from the standpoint of Lutheran pietism. Bousset drew the conclusion that Christianity must outgrow the limits of traditional pietism.

We may grant that the narrowness of pietism needs correction, and yet something remains to be said. It is true, we moderns need Goethe and Bismarck. We need Goethe's ideal of an all-round spiritual culture and his embodiment of it as a corrective of the spiritual poverty which follows our growing specialization in intellectual pursuits and our concentration on practical achievements. We need Bismarck, with his stubborn loyalty and concentration of purpose, his courage, his readiness of resource, and his ability to distinguish shadows from realities.

But an historian of prophetic insight would tell us that we owe our recent calamities and present difficulties very largely to the fact that we moderns have admired Goethe and Bismarck so unreservedly and so uncritically. This is particularly true of the fascination of Bismarck and his statesmanship. We must, after all, judge Goethe and Bismarck by Jesus, and not *vice versa*. We still need to lay hold more fully and more firmly of that for which Christ has laid hold of us. It is not in the name and spirit of Goethe, still less of Bismarck, that we can realize the good life in the modern world.

Something similar is true of that other great figure whose name now inspires hope or fear in so many breasts. Karl Marx is to be the formative influence of the immediate future, and men are looking to him for salvation. It is true that he has something of the prophet's moral indignation, and that in his hatred of oppression and exploitation he carried on the prophetic tradition. But intellectually he was masterful and proud, disdainful of others, harsh, bitter, unloving and unjust. Only a bourgeois could hate the bourgeoisie as Marx did, and judge them so unfairly. And this bitterness of spirit is supposed to be the class-consciousness of the workers. It is not in this spirit that social wrongs are righted and humanity set free. If we let Marx usurp the place of Jesus, we shall suffer for it. Our wisdom is to lay hold of that for which Jesus Christ has laid hold of us.

Nor need we despair of making progress in the direction which St. Paul invites us to pursue. There is a sad passage in one of Thomas Hardy's letters, written in June 1919—the year and month of the Peace Treaty. 'I should care more for my birthdays if at each succeeding one I could see any sign of real improvement in the world—as at one time I fondly hoped there was . . . I almost think that people were

less pitiless towards their fellow-creatures—human and animal—under the Roman Empire, than they are now : so why does not Christianity throw up the sponge and say, "I am beaten," and let another religion take its place ?

But unless there is some other and better religion in sight, this is simply cowardice and moral defeatism ; and there is no real justification for it, since, if

with all our modern resources we seek to lay hold of that for which Christ has laid hold of us, we shall reap if we faint not ; and even now in our day and generation we may see greater things accomplished in Christ's name, in Christ's spirit, than any recorded in previous history. Let us gird up our loins and press towards the goal.¹

¹ H. G. Wood, in *Sermons of the Year 1932*, p. 117.

Divine Healing.

BY THE REVEREND ALEXANDER SMALL, B.D., BOREHAM WOOD, HERTS.

A GREAT deal of prominence has been given to this subject during recent months. Many feel that the Church has lamentably failed to emphasize and practise the healing of the sick. This charge of failure to fulfil her responsibilities raises many questions, and makes us ask what are the assumptions underlying this practice of 'divine healing.'

We may define 'divine healing' as a method of healing body and mind by the direct act of God without the intervention of man, in response to an act of faith. Why, however, should we speak of healing of this kind as 'divine' ? It marks it off as essentially different from that which results from the use of scientific means, and implies that such healing is not divine, or, at least, that the less there is of such means, the more divine the healing is. Surely this is wrong. The use of scientific means of healing is merely man working to produce those conditions in which healing becomes possible ; and the healing is just as much of God as if it came about without any human intervention at all. If this latter healing is the only 'divine healing,' then it logically follows that we should practise no other, or feel distressed that we had to resort to a method that failed of the best. There is no reason to suppose, however, that 'divine healing' is necessarily any better than healing of any other kind.

It rests on a view of grace that is open to serious objection. It views the grace of God as a direct influx of His Spirit into the spirit of man, somewhat akin to a reservoir receiving pure water from an invisible spring. This is to regard the grace of God as quasi-material to be given or withheld as God sees fit. Is the grace of God of this nature ? Is it not rather a gracious relationship to all His children irrespective of their deserts ? Is it not a

wrong conception altogether that it is given at one time, and withheld at another ? Would it not be truer to say that there is no experience that can come to us in which His grace is not revealed ; and that we need only to be alive to spiritual realities to see how gracious the Lord is ? This 'divine healing' rests on the assumption that God's grace in sickness must necessarily reveal itself in the gift of health : it does not see the gracious activity of God in sickness. This does not mean that God wants us to be unhealthy ; but it does mean that He is as gracious to us in sickness as in health. 'Divine healing' is based on the idea that God gives us His healing grace directly we believe that He will heal us, irrespective of our relationship to God, to life, and to others. If that were true, why do so many remain unhealed ? Indeed, we might go further and ask why there is any sickness or suffering in the world at all. Surely if God deals thus directly with our spirits, He could prevent all sickness from ever appearing ; and the fact that He does not would seem to suggest His unwillingness to be gracious. The advocates of 'divine healing' would doubtless reply that God would so act if only we believed He would ; for they attribute all their failures to effect a cure to a lack of faith. It might occur to them that their failures may have another explanation, and be due to a wrong view of grace, and to a misunderstanding of what faith is, for their view of faith is no less suspect than their view of grace.

Faith in their view is a confidence that God will heal ; so that everything is done to remove doubt, to silence the critical faculty, and to hold the mind to the belief that healing will undoubtedly take place. Is this the essence of Christian faith ?

Indeed, is it faith in the Christian sense at all? We are told if only we have faith healing will take place; and that it is due to a lack of faith that cure is impossible, a lack which it is in our power to remedy, and for which we alone are responsible. If that is true, we would ask, as Dr. Oman asks in his *Grace and Personality*, how is faith God's gift to us? ¹ and if it is God's gift, why is it that some do not possess it, and why should they be blamed for a lack of it? This kind of faith is not dependent upon any experience that convinces men of its truth. It is not the conviction of the reality of things we do not see; but an endeavour to convince ourselves of something we fail to see: it is a leap in the dark in the hope that it will not land us in the void. It is difficult to see what significance the life and teaching of Jesus have for this kind of faith, except in so far as Jesus is regarded as relying on it in His healing ministry. Was faith to Jesus just a venturing upon God in the hope that He would act directly upon the spirit of man? Was it not rather something that sprang out of a right relation to God expressed in a right relation to life and to men? Was not faith something that came to Him as an overwhelming conviction as He was utterly loyal to God's will? Faith is not something that we can by any mental gymnastics achieve. No amount of thinking it is ours makes it so, and no effort on our part to exert it can possibly produce it. Faith is ours only in so far as we are utterly convinced because we can't help being convinced, and not as we seek to convince ourselves. The endeavour to make ourselves believe springs from doubt and fear, not from faith. A beautiful landscape may stretch before me; but I may be so insensitive to beauty as not to be able to realize it. Others may tell me about it; they may have seen the beauty for themselves, and tell me to believe in it; but no endeavour on my part to believe what they tell me is of any value. Only as I see the beauty without any one else having to impress me is there any faith on my part in the beauty that is there waiting for my appreciation. Any other attempt to believe in it is insincere, and will always bring with it a sense of unreality. So it is with faith in God: it is only faith when conviction comes without any effort on my part save the effort of being sincere in the face of reality. On any other basis faith is not a gift, but the reward of direct effort, and of man's achievement.

Again, this faith that demands God's direct action expects Him to act without any regard to whether or not we are fulfilling God's will. Men expect God

to heal by His direct act as if their relationship to God, to life, and to others had nothing to do with their mental or physical health. This kind of faith might make a man suffering from indigestion ask for direct healing when all the time the cause of his trouble was gluttony. It might make a man ask for tranquillity of mind when he was being dishonest, or adopting an attitude of hostility to some one, or in some other way being untrue to some spiritual vision. If God acted directly like that in response to our requests, we should no longer be living in a universe where moral and spiritual values had any place; and the experiences of life would have no religious significance at all. It is true that many who believe in 'divine healing' welcome medical aid; but, even so, there is an underlying belief that when doctors have done everything and healing still lingers, God will, by His direct action, fill up the lack. If so, why does not God go all the way, and make medical aid unnecessary? Some indeed distrust all medical aid; and they would seem to be more logical in doing so than those who go only half-way.

We do not expect to gain mastery over the elements until we have discovered the laws of Nature. The sea has sent thousands to their doom; but the toll of the sea is gradually being reduced as we are able to construct ships powerful enough to stand against the fiercest tempests. The air has claimed large numbers of victims; but we have reason to believe that the time will come when man will have complete mastery in the air. We do not expect God to act directly upon our spirits so as to make disasters by land, air, and sea impossible. Yet this view of faith in the direct action of God logically leads to this conclusion; and some believe that in response to faith, God will preserve us from every disaster. A Christian Scientist told me quite recently that he was preserved during the War from all harm because in response to his faith in the Fatherhood of God, God made all the shells that dropped near him ineffective. Why should we expect God to act directly on our spirits to heal us of disease without gaining the same mastery over it and in the same way as we do over the elements of Nature? Is there not something very much finer in this victory over Nature by means of the application of scientific methods, the knowledge of which has been gained by arduous toil and courageous experiment, than by a victory gained by the direct action of God upon our spirits? If not, then all the diligent study and patient experiment on the part of men would seem to be a misdirection of energy.

¹ *Grace and Personality*, p. 132.

Those who practise 'divine healing' will tell us that it works. They will marshal evidence to prove that large numbers have been healed in this way, many of whom were regarded by the medical faculty as incurable. Even when we take into account that in some cases there may have been a wrong diagnosis, there still remains a large number of cases that cannot be accounted for except on the assumption that healing did take place under the influence of a healing mission. How are we to account for such results?

Many healings are of functional diseases, that is, of disorders that are not due to any physical disease. It would be true to say that at these healing services more are healed of disorders such as functional blindness, deafness, speechlessness, or paralysis, than of physical diseases. In these cases all that seems to be lacking to effect a cure is the belief in the possibility of performing the various bodily functions. All the physical possibilities of sight, hearing, speaking, or movement are present, only the belief in the possibility is lacking in the mind of the patient; and where that belief can be implanted in the mind, healing takes place. There is no doubt that many cases of 'divine healing' are of this kind; but such healings are common among the patients of medical psychologists, and the cures in no way depend upon belief in God: they depend upon an altered attitude of mind, due to suggestion, or to insight into the nature of the trouble.

Yet it seems useless to deny that many healings are of definite physical diseases diagnosed as such by competent doctors. It is certain that in some diseases there is a psychic factor that delays, even if it does not altogether prevent, cure. Why this should be so remains a mystery. A woman was suffering from a skin disease that continued in spite of medical attention. A psychical examination revealed a spiritual conflict. This was resolved and the skin disease disappeared. A man constantly suffered from sickness when he was due to appear before an audience to speak. He was told that it was due to constitutional weakness, and that he would gradually get worse. As a matter of fact, it was due to violent repression of desires that he did not want to face; but as soon as the mental conflict was understood and resolved the sickness never returned. We know that the body is affected by our mental and spiritual attitudes, but to what extent we cannot say. Our digestion may be upset by worry. Attacks of sneezing, coughing, and asthma may be brought on by anxiety when there is some hereditary predisposition to these attacks.

Under hypnosis a powerful suggestion of burning may make a blister form on the body just as if the body had been actually burnt; and it is acknowledged that stigmata have actually appeared on the feet and hands as a result of continuous meditation on the Cross of Jesus. Further, certain mental attitudes make the simulation of some diseases possible, so that only with difficulty can the simulation be detected. To what extent the mind is able to induce actual disease of the body we cannot definitely say; but we can say that in some cases of disease cure is impossible without an altered mental attitude. This may be brought about in a healing service or in other ways, so that healing which up to that time was impossible becomes possible and sometimes rapid.

But because healing takes place in the atmosphere of, or as a result of, a healing service, it does not necessarily follow that it is the business of the Church to provide this type of service. There is no doubt that suggestion plays a very large part in effecting the cures; and it is a debatable question as to how far suggestion should be deliberately used in connexion with a religious service. It is impossible to prevent any one from being sensitive to suggestion. We are all more or less influenced by it; yet the minister of Jesus Christ should be concerned to help people to stand upon their own feet. His primary purpose should be to persuade rather than to impress, to enable people to see truth for themselves than to accept it on authority. He will always be aware that many of immature character are accepting truth on authority rather than as a result of their own spiritual insight; and while he cannot prevent it, he will not encourage it unless in exceptional cases as a temporary measure until they are able to exercise independent judgments. Suggestion is undoubtedly valuable in many cases of physical and mental disease; but it seems to be true that its value varies in the inverse ratio of the development of the critical faculty. Those who have arrived at a greater maturity of character benefit less, if at all, than those who are less mature. Does not this suggest that God's purpose is that man should attain personal insight and knowledge into the nature of things rather than depend upon the suggestions of another, however helpful they may prove to be when acted upon.

We hear far more of the successes that result from healing services than of the failures. We do not hear of how many go in a spirit of hopefulness, and afterwards fall into despondency; of how many become embittered; of how many, trying

hard to believe, find such effort futile, and who consequently wonder what kind of a God they have to deal with. We do not hear of how many alleged healings subsequently turn out to be failures. We do not know how many suffer agonies of mind because they cannot discover the faith which they earnestly seek, and feel the fault is theirs. Again, as we have said, these healings take place under the guidance and direction of medical psychologists where religious belief plays no essential part in the cures. Why, then, should the Christian Church introduce into its services methods of healing that have no essential connexion with Christianity, and which are better left to the medical faculty using known and proved scientific methods? We do not doubt at all the sincerity of those who practise 'divine healing,' nor the helpfulness of the services to many; but we are of the opinion that the ministry of healing should be left to those who have received the necessary scientific training in the cure of disease.

We shall be reminded that Jesus healed in this way, and that 'divine healing' has New Testament sanction. Yet we know too little about the healing ministry of Jesus to be dogmatic. Did the healing miracles of Jesus take place just as they are recorded, or have we only abridged accounts of the events? The briefest accounts are given in the Gospels, too brief to speak with certainty of the methods adopted by Jesus. Further, the healing ministry of Jesus raises questions regarding the self-emptying of Jesus, and how far the methods He

employed were the result of the age in which He lived when the scientific treatment of disease was almost unknown. Nor can we estimate the power of the Personality of Jesus, wholly obedient to the divine will, to cast out fears and obsessions, and to awaken that faith in spiritual realities where the healing power of God becomes effective. Yet we must not forget that it is the very Spirit of Jesus, the Spirit of compassion and love for suffering humanity, that has inspired men to seek to discover the causes of, and remedies for, disease, and that has given rise to the modern scientific methods for combating it. Leprosy has received its death-blow by the discovery of an oil which, if injected into the patient, will arrest the disease. Modern surgery and medicine and the practice of psychotherapy have done wonders to relieve and cure suffering humanity; and with the further advance of science much more will be done to conquer diseases both of the body and mind.

Yet we must never overlook the fact that disease is so often the result of past or present individual or collective sin, that we may safely say that until men seek first the Kingdom of God disease will never be finally conquered. Here is where the Church of Jesus Christ must play a part that cannot be delegated to any one else. The Church's business is to beseech men in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God, so that those barriers that prevent the healing power of God coming to them may be removed, and those conditions realized in society which shall make for physical and mental health.

Contributions and Comments.

The German Church Question.

I HAVE just received a clipping from THE EXPOSITORY TIMES dealing with an article of mine in connexion with the German Church question. In order to avoid misunderstandings I want you to know that since the so-called Confessional Synods of Barmen and Dahlem, the usual definition of the German Evangelical Church is that this Church cannot be recognized as a Church in the full sense of the word, but as a 'federation of churches determined by their own confessions' (*Bund bekenntnisbestimmter Kirchen*). This definition has been adopted unanimously by those synods which repre-

sented practically the whole of the German churches except the Teutonic Christians and some Modernists who do not like ecclesiastical confessions at all. The reason was that in Germany, as in Great Britain, there are several evangelical churches, divided not only by geographical frontiers but also by differences in doctrine (Lutherans, Reformed and United Churches of different types, some of the latter being united in doctrine, some as, e.g. the Evangelical Church of the Old Prussian Union comprehending Lutheran and Reformed congregations within one ecclesiastical system), order (most of the Lutheran Churches have a sort of episcopal constitution, while the others are something like Presbyterian), and

liturgy. A struggle like that which we had in this country would find its centre in the question of the freedom of the Church as an ecclesiastical organization, if it took place in Britain (as, e.g. the heroic struggle of the Free Church of Scotland). With us (this may be a German sickness or a virtue, we cannot decide that) every question becomes dogmatic.

What we had to demand from the State was that the doctrine, the teaching of the Church should be allowed, as it had been for centuries. It was impossible to put out some of the new bishops and to take away from them ecclesiastical power except by the way of showing that their doctrine was intolerable for the Church, and that our bishops by their office were obliged to have no communion with them as heretics. You may be astonished in England to hear that fact, but it is true, and I am speaking as one who took part in all these struggles from the very beginning. It has been the Augsburg Confession of 1530 and the legal status which this confession now still holds in Germany which has saved so far the Landeskirchen (the relatively autonomous regional churches), and their freedom of teaching the doctrine of the Reformation. In this situation it was impossible to put away the confessions of the sixteenth century, especially because these confessions, as Luther's Catechism and the Augsburg Confession, are now still a real living power showing, to the average member of the Church, what the Church stands for.

You must not think that the liberal theology which outside of Germany has been regarded as a characteristic feature of Germany has had much influence on the Church life. This was true of some cities like Frankfurt and some territories like the Rheinpfalz. Our professors used to write their critical books on their desks in Marburg, Göttingen, Berlin; but the life of the churches was not directly influenced by them. From this point of view you must understand the revival of the Lutheran and the Reformed Confession. If you must fight for the right of the doctrine of your church, you cannot but take it seriously. Over against the threatenings of a new heathenism we did not fight for the freedom of teaching the religion of Schleiermacher or Ritschl or anybody else, or for the freedom of teaching the gospel according to the understanding of each individual pastor—even Ludwig Müller wanted to teach the gospel; and why should his teaching not be recognized as gospel, if Schleiermacher is regarded as a legitimate interpreter of the gospel?—but we had to fight for the *sola gratia, sola fide*. If a new heathenism appears on the horizon, you cannot but

acknowledge that since the Fall of Adam all men are born with sin, that is, without fear of God, without trust in God, and with concupiscence; and that this disease or vice of origin is truly sin, even now condemning and bringing eternal death upon those not born again through baptism and the Holy Ghost, as the old confession says. If you meet the Antichrist, you understand the doctrine of Chalcedon, not earlier. If one has to fight that struggle which St. Paul mentions (Eph 6¹²) then one can understand the doctrine of the blessed Trinity. These are some of our experiences.

These experiences have led from the beginning of the great struggle for the Church to the recognition that the Lutheran and the Reformed Church are two churches as long as they have not reached a new common confession; and this is true. Therefore we regard the so-called German Evangelical Church—which was a premature fruit of the year 1933—as a federation of the Lutheran, Reformed, and United Churches. There is indeed a certain opposition against this definition of the Confessional Synods. The Liberals, who are almost without a following among the people but who, from happier days, own some magazines and Church papers, have always protested against everything which looks like confessionalism. Among the United Churches there are circles which want the whole of German Protestantism to accept their union. But the pity is that in Germany we have about seven different United churches who cannot unite into one single church. This is the pitiful lesson of the nineteenth century with us. In Prussia, in Baden, in Nassau, in the Hessian territories and elsewhere the Lutheran and the Reformed Church tried to unite. But the conditions were everywhere different. In the beginning of the nineteenth century we had two evangelical confessions in different territorial churches. After the unions we had not, as you would expect, three (for until now the foundation of each United Church has proved to be the foundation of a new denomination), but at least six or seven! It is difficult to unite churches. But it is almost impossible to unite united churches—if the conditions of church union are different! How will you unite the United Church of Canada with the United Church of South India, if this Union comes into being?

These difficulties which we encountered in trying to bring about Church Union in Germany have led us to the conviction that the union of the churches can be brought about only by a new understanding and by finding *general* conditions of union between the great Confessions as is being tried in the World

Conference on Faith and Order. The nineteenth century believed in church union by neglecting or minimizing the doctrinal questions. Therefore it failed. It seems to me that the only way is the way of Lausanne, if we can be patient. I confess myself to be a loyal and really faithful adherent of the Lausanne Movement, since I studied the denominational question in U.S.A. Three things are within the limits of possibility. First: the great number of denominations can be limited by bringing together the small churches of each confession. Within a generation it is possible to have five or six Protestant Churches instead of 200. Between these Churches and the non-Roman Catholic Churches can be established, what the Ecumenical Patriarch suggested after the Great War and what Dr. Deissmann so earnestly favoured since then: a *koinonia ton ekklesion*, a federation of the Churches. This is the second possibility. The third is the earnest exchange of ideas on Faith, Order, and Practical work in the ecumenical movement (Lausanne, Stockholm, Jerusalem). It is not true, that this is a merely academic enterprise. The churches of Christendom know far more of each other to-day than in 1910. Our students know more of the churches in Great Britain and U.S.A. than was ever the case. Lutheranism has learnt more from the Anglican Church within the last ten years than it has learnt for centuries. I can imagine that the same is true with other churches. My greatest achievement in knowledge of ecclesiastical life was the understanding of the Anglican and the Orthodox churches in the Lausanne Movement. Formerly I shared the idea that it might be possible to unite the Protestant churches. Since Lausanne I know that there is no Protestantism in a theological sense at all. There are Protestant churches. But even if you succeed in uniting them you have no united church. There is no real church union without the Catholic churches. For they have preserved something, which the Lutheran Church, e.g. has preserved until the eighteenth century also: that is its sacramentalism. It is true that this Christian heritage is, according to our conviction, combined with false ideas. But it is still there. Do you really think it would be an advantage for the cause of Christian union if the Lutheran Church did not stress its doctrine on the Real Presence of the body and blood in the Sacrament of the altar? Might it not prove one day to be a real help for unity that even in an Evangelical Church the Catholic doctrine in this case had been preserved?

But I am not entitled to take so much of your time. I wanted to tell you that the confessional

Lutheranism in this country is not opposed to Christian unity, but that it has something to say from its own bitter experiences on the great hindrance which a false union may mean to the true unity of the Church of Christ. Will you please make use of these lines as you like.

HERMANN SASSE.

Erlangen.

Pella in the El-Amarna Tablets.

IN Professor Robinson's very courteous, but positive, reply (in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May 1936, p. 380) to my note on 'The Possible Mention of Joshua's Conquest in the El-Amarna Letters' he says: 'Aiab's city is called in the letter Bihisi (so read by Knudtzon, Weber, and Ebeling), which may be Pella, but looks unlike it (the Egyptian form of Pella, on a monument of Seti I., is PHR—Egyptian R=Semitic L),' etc. In view of the positive inferences drawn from this statement, which, to one not an Assyriologist, is quite misleading, it is but fair to call attention to the fact that the reading of Knudtzon and the others is not *Bihisi*, but *Bikhishi* (i.e. *Bihishi*). In the cuneiform syllabary of the period the sounds *bi* and *pi* are frequently both represented by the sign employed. The sign transliterated *shi* by these scholars is also regularly employed in Semitic cuneiform for writing the syllable *lim*.¹ The reading *Pi-ih-lim* is accordingly quite as correct as *Bi-ih-shi*. The *m* at the end of *lim* is the regular Assyrian mimmation which is of no more significance at the end of words than is the nunation in Arabic. *Pi-ih-lim* is just the equivalent of the Egyptian PHR and of the Talmudic Pahal, the name for Pella. *Bihshi* is utterly unknown. Pella is well known in every period. Why adhere to the mistaken readings of earlier interpreters, when both phonology and geography point us to the correct reading? Pella was an east-Jordan city, and fulfils all the conditions which Professor Robinson mentioned. As Olmstead pointed out in 1931, it is undoubtedly the true reading, though I confess that I have inadvertently retained 'Bikhishi' in one line of the letter in *Archaeology and the Bible*. Further, Joshua could not be transliterated in cuneiform more accurately than in *Ja-shu-ia*. The case of Benjamin is not quite so convincing, but is probable. The readings cannot be rejected on Assyriological grounds.

¹ See R. Brünnow, *Classified List of Cuneiform Ideographs*, No. 9263.

Doubtless we all share Professor Robinson's desire to place as much reliance as possible on the early traditions in the Hexateuch, but I am sure that he would not press the point so far as to deny the evidence of contemporary documents. How that evidence is to be interpreted is, of course, still an open question. There may have been more than one Joshua and more than one Benjamin. So conservative a scholar as Professor W. F. Albright is of the opinion that the archaeological evidence compels us to believe that in the Biblical traditions the chronological and historical perspective has been lost in the creation of ideal sagas. Reluctantly I have come to share that opinion.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

University of Pennsylvania.

Once again I have to thank the Editors of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for the courtesy which has allowed me to see Professor Barton's new note. I am certainly not one of that very small company of people who are in a position to challenge his opinion on an Assyriological question, and I confess that the new reading which he mentions had escaped me. But I still feel that, even if it be necessary to follow Dr. Albright in the opinion quoted in Dr. Barton's last sentence, the identification of Iashua with Joshua would carry us much too far, and would utterly discredit Hebrew tradition as an evidence of historical fact.

T. H. ROBINSON.

University College, Cardiff.

'Atonement' in the English Language.

THE word 'atonement' is used only once in the Authorized Version of the New Testament—in Ro 5¹¹. In the Revised Version it is not used at all, this passage employing the word 'reconciliation.' The Greek word *καταλλάγή* appears elsewhere than in this passage, but it is always translated 'reconciliation.' And the verb *καταλλάσσω* is always so translated. And while we have come to use the word 'atonement' to gather up and centralize ideas not necessarily expressed by the word 'reconciliation,' it is clear that the translators of the Authorized Version on the one occasion when they used the word 'atonement' instead of 'reconciliation' had no intention of departing from the one meaning. There is no ground for doubting

that it was mere variation of expression, common enough in the translation. One reason for saying this is that it can be proved conclusively that atonement, signifying to make satisfaction or to expiate, is not, as far as the English language is concerned, 'the old gospel' at all. When the Authorized Version was published, atonement meant reconciliation, neither more nor less. Its use in the sense of expiation does not appear before the second half of the seventeenth century. For example, Shakespeare uses the word ten times. Thus:

Then is there mirth in heaven,
When earthly things made even
Atone together

(i.e. become reconciled with one another).

As You Like It, v. iv. 115.

or, again:

I would do much
To atone them, for the love I bear to Cassio
(i.e. to bring them together in reconciliation).

Othello, iv. i. 244.

and on no occasion in any other sense. Examples are given in the *New English Dictionary* from other writers, e.g.:

The constable is called to atone the broil.

John Heywood (1565).

and,

*Which never can be set at onement more.

Joseph Hall, Satires (1599).

where we have a late use of the original form, that is, in two words. In Beaumont and Fletcher's *Spanish Curate* (1622) we have:

I have been atoning two most wrangling neighbours,

where the sense is particularly clear, as it is in Ben Jonson's *Silent Woman*:

Nay, if he had been cool enough to tell me that,
There had been some hope to atone you.

The first instance in English literature of the modern use of the word is in 1665. Even then there is perhaps some dubiety about the meaning, but in 1682 Dryden, in *Religio Laici*, puts the new sense, in which the word is now used, clearly:

If sheep and oxen could atone for men.

But in the days of the authorized translation such a use was absolutely unknown.

The word 'atonement,' then, in English meant not other than reconciliation.

But who is reconciled? That is the question. *The Twentieth-Century New Testament*, in the passage where it is translated 'atonement' in the Authorized Version, writes '*this* reconciliation'; Dr. Moffatt says '*our* reconciliation.' Dr. Garvie, in the *Century Bible*, puts it '*the* reconciliation.' Who, then, is reconciled? Is it God, or man, or both? If language means anything at all, it is distinctly and explicitly stated that it is we who are reconciled to God. At the same time, it has to be noted that this reconciliation is through Jesus Christ sent from God. It is the gift of God's grace, and in any case there is no such thing as a reconciliation which is not mutual. The reasons keeping two apart may originate wholly with one, but apart they are. Love, on the one side, may remain deep and unchanging, but it is a love that suffers. A father, who has a rebellious son who constitutes himself an enemy, goes on loving, but it is a sorrowful love. Love may be very sorrowful, causing pain; or a sheer joy. It remains love either way; but when the sin and enmity and rebellion are taken away, from whatever valid cause, the sense of reconciliation is mutual, as truly as it is God-given.

INNES LOGAN.

Edinburgh.

The Prayer of St. Chrysostom.

IN reference to your correspondent's letter in the May 1935 number, I would like to say that no deduction can be made as to the authorship of this prayer from its current *English* translation, which does not accord in one important particular with the Greek original, where we read that where two or three '*agree together*,' not '*are gathered together*' their requests will be granted. The reference in the prayer is clearly to Mt 18¹⁹ and not 18²⁰. There is therefore no reason why the statement about our Lord being in the midst should have been included in the prayer, and there is no safe ground here for the argument that the writer has misquoted our Lord, and was unlearned in the Scriptures, and so could not have been St. Chrysostom or St. Basil. In all discussion about ancient prayers it is essential to note what is actually said in the original, and not to base any argument upon a faulty English translation.

In the recently revised liturgy of the Church of Iran, here, as in other places, English translations have been set aside, and the original rendering followed as closely as possible.

R. N. SHARP.

All Saints' Church, Yazd, Iran.

Entre Nous.

Spiritual Healing.

Readers of the interesting article on 'Divine Healing,' printed earlier in this issue, will be glad to hear something which may be regarded as being on 'the other side.' The Rev. John Maillard is the author of a book just issued: *Healing in the Name of Jesus* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). In this book he insists strongly that what is aimed at by the Movement associated with the name of Mr. Hickson is not the healing of the body only, but healing of the whole person. 'Jesus does more than restore our sight. He gives us *spiritual vision*. He came not only to heal men's bodies: He came to give sufferers *Life* that is worth living in these bodies.' And this: 'I have never limited the healing ministry of the Church to the physical needs of man, or overlooked its spiritual application.'

But of course he insists as strongly that the healing of the body is part of the mission of the Church. Jesus commanded His disciples to heal the sick. 'This is the mission of His Church, to do God's will, to minister His gifts which are gifts of life, which bring healing to the sick, holiness and righteousness to the sinful. . . . What we all need is to be so filled with the Spirit that when we pray for others in our Lord's name, His Spirit may destroy the corruption of disease.'

God's will is not sickness, but health. For all His children it is perfection, beauty, happiness. And we are set here to get His will done. We are His instruments. Not specially favoured people but all of us who are filled with His Spirit. Christ laid His hands on sufferers. So do we. But there are other forms of touch. One is prayer. 'At one of

our services we were seeking to touch the life of a young man who was as far away as China. The mother came to the service very distressed, knowing that her son was seriously ill. Through that ministry of prayer and touch which she there received on behalf of her son, God's love was conveyed, and we know that that young man, thousands of miles away, was reached and strengthened just as definitely as his mother who knelt at the altar.'

After all, cases are important. And here is another. 'There were many remarkable results. Amongst them I witnessed the healing of one of our Catechism girls who was crippled with infantile paralysis and had to wear a surgical boot and irons. When I visited the East End three years after the War she was a young woman. I should not have recognized her. The healing was perfect.' Another was a case of cancer, a woman operated on several times. Prayer, with laying on of hands, followed later by the Holy Communion, brought complete cure. So much so that, when she visited her old hospital, the Sister stared at her, and exclaimed: 'Why, you are a resurrection!'

Healing in the name of Jesus is healing through human, consecrated, spirit-filled people. Those who have given themselves to the work of intercession for the sick and suffering must be completely surrendered, so that, through the surrender of their lives, Christ, our Master, may work perfectly, and the fulness of His love and Spirit may reach the hearts and lives and bodies of those for whom prayer is made. There is nothing God cannot do through such Spirit-filled lives.

Nothing? 'I am so often asked, "Do you believe that organic diseases can be healed, or only functional?"' The answer is that the distinction between functional and organic diseases is entirely artificial. 'Some most able doctors to-day wipe it out. . . . We are the children of God, therefore never let anything come between us and God's power.' Nowhere in the Bible does God speak of incurability. Sickness cannot thrive or gain ground within an atmosphere of divine love and communion.

Let the sufferer be 'walled in by prayer.' 'Is that Bayswater 4249? Please hold on for a trunk call coming through the Bristol Exchange. Hullo! Hullo! Yes, this is Bayswater 4249. Yes, this is Mr. Maillard speaking. . . . What is that? Temperature 105.' An S.O.S. call for prayer, a spiritual conversation, a meditation, and an act of prayer communion were all shared within the six minutes of a telephonic trunk communica-

tion. Immediately the home of the sufferer was 'walled in' by prayer and the room of the sufferer doubly 'walled in.' The temperature was down from 105 to 103 within an hour that night, and to 99'3 the following morning.

The Moral Life for the State.

In the June issue of that excellent small periodical, published for Lay Preachers by the Methodist Publishing House—*The Preachers' and Class-Leaders' Magazine*, there is a study of the Christian as a Politician. The Rev. W. J. Tunbridge has chosen for his example John Bright, man of the people, cotton spinner from Rochdale, and the first member of the Society of Friends to enter Parliament. 'He fought for the Corn Laws and every battle brought him fresh laurels. He fought against the Crimea and every battle added to his ignominy. "I know very well, and you must know," he said to a Manchester audience, "that there are steeples of Alma in morals as well as in the field of battle." More than twenty years after that, when he had recovered the position he had lost and men knew that he was right about that war, he resigned his seat in the Cabinet because he disagreed with the Egyptian campaign, and once more went out into the wilderness. The words he uttered when explaining his resignation might be written in letters of gold: "The House knows that at least I have endeavoured from time to time to teach my countrymen an opinion and doctrine which I hold, which is, that the moral law is not intended only for individual life but is intended also for the life and practice of States. I cannot repudiate what I have preached and taught during the period of a rather long political life."'

Guidance.

In the same number of *The Preachers' and Class-Leaders' Magazine*, there is a study of the mysticism of Catherine of Genoa, where her habit of living in the present moment is stressed. The writer, the Rev. Albert Dickinson, passes on then to Father de Caussade and Newman. He quotes from Abbé Bremond: "'One of the Masterpieces of French mysticism, the Letters of Father de Caussade, have really solved the problem. The guiding voice of God presents itself to us, not as a luminous whole, but broken up into a series of small glimmering lights. It is the large prism of 'present duty' splitting up every moment the Divine ray, and showing us not the complete scroll of directions for the way, but just what is necessary to be seen in order to take one step in advance."

And he adds: "Take this doctrine, interpret it in English fashion (*i.e.* practically), and you will know one of the first principles of Newman's piety."

Never stopped Learning.

Frank Woolley, the famous Kent cricketer, tells in his volume of reminiscences, *The King of Games*, of the first occasion he played before Captain McCanlis: "He met me at the end of the net, put his arm round my shoulder as we walked away and said: "You played quite well, my boy. You would like to play one day for Kent, wouldn't you?" "I would, sir, very much indeed." And well I recall his reply: "You will, my boy, you will, providing you always remember," he said in his slow, thoughtful way, "that you have never stopped learning about cricket!"

The Search for Truth.

'Towards the middle of 1934 there was an article in *The Times Literary Supplement* about Emily Brontë, saying that Charlotte had revised some of Emily's poems—chiefly the punctuation, and giving "No coward soul is mine" as Emily wrote it.

'And there was Smuts, in the midst of a serious political business that was driving him from platform to platform over thousands of miles of country, due in a few minutes to go off to a party meeting, there he was cutting out this article on Emily Brontë because it was important to him to have the poem exactly as Emily wrote it. "No, I do not agree that a comma doesn't matter, and the poem did very well all these years as it was. A thing like this belongs to the search for truth—the meaning beyond. It is the soul. You alter a word and you alter the emotional figure—you alter the shape of the torso of the soul. . . .

"That is why I am glad I can read the New Testament in Greek. Those people were grappling with something beyond their understanding, trying to express the unattainable truth. Translate their words, change a shade of their meaning, and you throw them out of the straight line of their quest, and what they were just about to touch is lost."'¹

¹ Sarah Gertrude Millin, *General Smuts*, 22.

Prayer.

Eternal Father of my soul, let my first thought to-day be of Thee, let my first impulse be to worship Thee, let my first speech be Thy name, let my first action be to kneel before Thee in prayer.

For Thy perfect wisdom and perfect goodness:
For the love wherewith Thou lovest mankind:
For the love wherewith Thou lovest me:
For the great and mysterious opportunity of my life:
For the indwelling of Thy Spirit in my heart:
For the sevenfold gifts of Thy Spirit:
I praise and worship Thee, O Lord.

Yet let me not, when this morning prayer is said, think my worship ended and spend the day in forgetfulness of Thee. Rather from these moments of quietness let light go forth, and joy, and power, that will remain with me through all the hours of the day;

Keeping me chaste in thought:
Keeping me temperate and truthful in speech:
Keeping me faithful and diligent in my work:
Keeping me humble in my estimation of myself:
Keeping me honourable and generous in my dealings with others:
Keeping me loyal to every hallowed memory of the past:
Keeping me mindful of my eternal destiny as a child of Thine.

O God, who hast been the Refuge of my fathers through many generations, be my Refuge to-day in every time and circumstance of need. Be my Guide through all that is dark and doubtful. Be my Guard against all that threatens my spirit's welfare. Be my Strength in time of testing. Gladden my heart with Thy peace; through Jesus Christ my Lord. Amen.¹

¹ J. Baillie, *A Diary of Private Prayer*, 9.